

It is a very short resolution. It simply purposes to change a name in the last Indian appropriation act. A large number of Indians were placed upon the roll as entitled to enrollment, and among them some Mississippi Choctaws, 21 in number, but the name of one of them was erroneously placed on the roll as Mitchell C. Adams, when it should have been William C. Adams. I ask for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to substitute the name of William C. Adams in place of Mitchell C. Adams, jr., in the list of Mississippi Choctaw Indians enumerated in Senate document No. 478, Sixty-third Congress, second session, which Indians so enumerated in said document were authorized to be enrolled on the respective rolls of the Five Civilized Tribes by section 17, paragraph 9, of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915," approved August 1, 1914.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

A bill (S. 6640) granting an increase of pension to Charles Pettys; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 6641) to transfer Capt. John Calvin Leonard from the retired to the active list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

T. S. WILLIAMS.

Mr. BRYAN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1055) for the relief of T. S. Williams having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$261"; and the House agree to the same.

N. P. BRYAN,

BLAIR LEE,

G. W. NORRIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

EDWARD W. POU,

H. D. STEPHENS,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

FREDERICK J. ERNST.

Mr. BRYAN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4405) for the relief of Frederick J. Ernst, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

N. P. BRYAN,

FRANK S. WHITE,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

EDWARD W. POU,

H. D. STEPHENS,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 18459. An act to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

RECESS.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow forenoon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m., Thursday, October 15, 1914) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, October 16, 1914, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, October 15, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou great Father soul, in whose all-embracing love we live and move and have our being, increase our faith and confidence in Thee, and teach us how to think great thoughts, to live noble lives, to grow old gracefully, to die peacefully, looking forward to the larger life which Thou hast prepared for Thy children, that we may honor ourselves and hallow Thy name. In the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Journal be approved.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky moves the approval of the Journal.

The Journal was approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RUBEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a speech delivered by my distinguished colleague, the Speaker of the House, at the opening of the campaign in New Jersey last Saturday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing a speech that I made at Atlantic City last night—

Mr. BUTLER. Last night?

The SPEAKER. Saturday night.

Mr. BUTLER. I shall not object to that one. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ALASKA COAL LANDS.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 14233) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, the previous order of the House as to Calendar Wednesday to the contrary notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on the Alaskan coal bill, notwithstanding that this is constructively Calendar Wednesday. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Printing, which has the right of way on Calendar Wednesday—that is to-day—has agreed to permit the consideration of this bill without demanding the regular order, because it believes that it is really emergent legislation, and therefore I shall not object to this request, with the understanding that immediately after the consideration of this bill the regular order will be requested.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, how much time for debate can we agree upon?

Mr. FERRIS. I do not think there is any disposition on this side to hurry the matter or attempt to shut anyone off. I do not propose to use much time myself.

Mr. MANN. I will be perfectly frank with the House. There are two or three gentlemen who wish to be heard for a short time, I think, not on this bill. I wondered if we could agree on some time for length of debate on the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think there should be some understanding as to the exact amount of time to be used. If it comes out of the time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART], he is more concerned than anybody else.

Mr. BARNHART. If there is a disposition to indulge in general debate, I wish to say that the consideration of the printing bill is now nearing its close, and the committee would certainly like to finish it after these many weeks of consideration. I hope the gentleman from Illinois will not desire to inject general debate into this bill. I trust there will be no general debate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that when this bill is out of the way—and the printing bill can not go over until to-morrow—so far as I am concerned, if the gentleman desires to secure reasonable opportunity for general debate to-morrow morning, I shall have no objection.

Mr. MANN. Well, I will ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and myself shall each have control of an hour to-morrow for general debate after the reading of the Journal.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object for a moment, I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that I understand there will be a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules to-morrow to take up this matter concerning the Board of Governors of the Soldiers' Home. I do not see the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POT] just now, but I understand that that measure will probably require half an hour for debate; so that I will ask the gentleman from Illinois if he would be willing to have that matter considered first, and then have the general debate he desires afterwards?

Mr. MANN. I would not have any objection to that, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman made his request as applying immediately after the reading of the Journal.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but I could not put it otherwise, because there is no certainty that the rule will be reported. It will be subject to the report of the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. What is the request?

Mr. MANN. That the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and myself each have control of one hour's time to-morrow immediately after the approval of the Journal, subject to the right of the Committee on Rules to bring in the rule referred to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and the disposition of the rule, if reported, he and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] shall each have an hour on the Alaskan coal bill.

Mr. MANN. No; on anything—general debate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; general debate.

Mr. MANN. Each to control an hour's time.

The SPEAKER. Is not this a conference report?

Mr. MANN. We will dispose of that now.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, in order to expedite the action of the House on this conference report, the gentleman from Illinois had indicated that he desires some time for general debate on that side of the House, and I have suggested to him that he can take that up to-morrow; and out of that suggestion has grown his request.

The SPEAKER. All right. The request is that to-morrow, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and the disposition of the rule concerning the Board of Governors of the Soldiers' Home, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] shall each have control of an hour for general debate. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] for the present consideration of the conference report on the Alaskan coal bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the conference report.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the conference report and that the report be printed in the Record.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Oklahoma that the statement is much longer than the conference report. I think the statement would not be as clear as the report.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1186.)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14223) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows. In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to survey the lands of the United States in the Territory of Alaska known to be valuable for their deposits of coal, preference to be given first in favor of surveying lands within those areas commonly known as the Bering River, Matanuska, and Nenana coal fields, and thereafter to such areas or coal fields as lie tributary to established settlements or existing or proposed rail or water transportation lines: *Provided*, That such surveys shall be executed in accordance with existing laws and rules and regulations governing the survey of public lands. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100,000 for the purpose of making the surveys herein provided for, to

continue available until expended: *Provided*, That any surveys heretofore made under the authority or by the approval of the Department of the Interior may be adopted and used for the purposes of this act.

"Sec. 2. That the President of the United States shall designate and reserve from use, location, sale, lease, or disposition not exceeding 5,120 acres of coal-bearing land in the Bering River field and not exceeding 7,680 acres of coal-bearing land in the Matanuska field, and not to exceed one-half of the other coal lands in Alaska: *Provided*, That the coal deposits in such reserved areas may be mined under the direction of the President when, in his opinion, the mining of such coal in such reserved areas, under the direction of the President, becomes necessary, by reason of an insufficient supply of coal at a reasonable price for the requirements of Government works, construction and operation of Government railroads, for the Navy, for national protection, or for relief from monopoly or oppressive conditions.

"Sec. 3. That the unreserved coal lands and coal deposits shall be divided by the Secretary of the Interior into leasing blocks or tracts of 40 acres each, or multiples thereof, and in such form as in the opinion of the Secretary will permit the most economical mining of the coal in such blocks, but in no case exceeding 2,560 acres in any one leasing block or tract; and thereafter, the Secretary shall offer such blocks or tracts and the coal, lignite, and associated minerals therein for leasing, and may award leases thereof through advertisement, competitive bidding, or such other methods as he may by general regulations adopt, to any person above the age of 21 years who is a citizen of the United States, or to any association of such persons, or to any corporation or municipality organized under the laws of the United States or of any State or Territory thereof: *Provided*, That a majority of the stock of such corporation shall at all times be owned and held by citizens of the United States: *And provided further*, That no railroad or common carrier shall be permitted to take or acquire through lease or permit under this act any coal or coal lands in excess of such area or quantity as may be required and used solely for its own use, and such limitation of use shall be expressed in all leases or permits issued to railroads or common carriers hereunder: *And provided further*, That any person, association, or corporation qualified to become a lessee under this act and owning any pending claim under the public-land laws to any coal lands in Alaska may, within one year from the passage of this act, enter into an arrangement with the Secretary of the Interior by which such claim shall be fully relinquished to the United States; and if in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior the circumstances connected with such claim justify so doing the moneys paid by the claimant or claimants to the United States on account of such claim shall, by direction of the Secretary of the Interior, be returned and paid over to such person, association, or corporation as a consideration for such relinquishment.

"All claims of existing rights to any of such lands in which final proof has been submitted and which are now pending before the Commissioner of the General Land Office or the Secretary of the Interior for decision shall be adjudicated within one year from the passage of this act.

"Sec. 4. That a person, association, or corporation holding a lease of coal lands under this act may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and through the same procedure and upon the same terms and conditions as in the case of an original lease under this act, secure a further or new lease covering additional lands contiguous to those embraced in the original lease, but in no event shall the total area embraced in such original and new leases exceed in the aggregate 2,560 acres.

"That upon satisfactory showing by any lessee to the Secretary of the Interior that all of the workable deposits of coal within a tract covered by his or its lease will be exhausted, worked out, or removed within three years thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior may, within his discretion, lease to such lessee an additional tract of land or coal deposits, which, including the coal area remaining in the original lease, shall not exceed 2,560 acres, through the same procedure and under the same competitive conditions as in case of an original lease.

"Sec. 5. That, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, lessees holding under leases small blocks or areas may consolidate their said leases or holdings so as to include in a single holding not to exceed 2,560 acres of contiguous lands.

"Sec. 6. That each lease shall be for such leasing block or tract of land as may be offered or applied for, not exceeding in area 2,560 acres of land, to be described by the subdivisions of the survey, and no person, association, or corporation, except as hereinafter provided, shall be permitted to take or hold any interest as a stockholder or otherwise in more than one such lease under this act, and any interest held in violation of this

proviso shall be forfeited to the United States by appropriate proceedings instituted by the Attorney General for that purpose in any court of competent jurisdiction, except that any such ownership and interest hereby forbidden which may be acquired by descent, will, judgment, or decree may be held for two years, and not longer, after its acquisition.

"Sec. 7. That any person who shall purchase, acquire, or hold any interest in two or more such leases, except as herein provided, or who shall knowingly purchase, acquire, or hold any stock in a corporation having an interest in two or more such leases, or who shall knowingly sell or transfer to one disqualified to purchase, or except as in this act specifically provided, disqualified to acquire any such interest, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than three years and by a fine not exceeding \$1,000: *Provided*, That any such ownership and interest hereby forbidden which may be acquired by descent, will, judgment, or decree may be held two years after its acquisition and not longer, and in case of minority or other disability such time as the court may decree.

"Sec. 8. That any director, trustee, officer, or agent of any corporation holding any interest in such a lease who shall, on behalf of such corporation, act in the purchase of any interest in another lease, or who shall knowingly act on behalf of such corporation in the sale or transfer of any such interest in any lease held by such corporation to any corporation or individual holding any interest in any such a lease, except as herein provided, shall be guilty of a felony and shall be subject to imprisonment for a term of not exceeding three years and a fine of not exceeding \$1,000.

"Sec. 8a. If any of the lands or deposits leased under the provisions of this act shall be subleased, trusted, possessed, or controlled by any device permanently, temporarily, directly, indirectly, tacitly, or in any manner whatsoever, so that they form part of or are in anywise controlled by any combination in the form of an unlawful trust, with consent of lessee, or form the subject of any contract or conspiracy in restraint of trade in the mining or selling of coal, entered into by the lessee, or of any holding of such lands by any individual, partnership, association, corporation, or control, in excess of 2,500 acres in the Territory of Alaska, the lease thereof shall be forfeited by appropriate court proceedings.

"Sec. 9. That for the privilege of mining and extracting and disposing of the coal in the lands covered by his lease the lessee shall pay to the United States such royalties as may be specified in the lease, which shall not be less than 2 cents per ton, due and payable at the end of each month succeeding that of the shipment of the coal from the mine, and an annual rental, payable at the beginning of each year, on the lands covered by such lease, at the rate of 25 cents per acre for the first year thereafter, 50 cents per acre for the second, third, fourth, and fifth years, and \$1 per acre for each and every year thereafter during the continuance of the lease, except that such rental for any year shall be credited against the royalties as they accrue for that year. Leases may be for periods of not more than 50 years each, subject to renewal, on such terms and conditions as may be authorized by law at the time of such renewal. All net profits from operation of Government mines, and all royalties and rentals under leases as herein provided, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States in a separate and distinct fund to be applied to the reimbursement of the Government of the United States on account of any expenditures made in the construction of railroads in Alaska, and the excess shall be deposited in the fund known as the Alaska Fund, established by the act of Congress of January 27, 1905, to be expended as provided in said last-mentioned act.

"Sec. 10. That in order to provide for the supply of strictly local and domestic needs for fuel the Secretary of the Interior may, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe in advance, issue to any applicant qualified under section 3 of this act a limited license or permit granting the right to prospect for, mine, and dispose of coal belonging to the United States on specified tracts not to exceed 10 acres to any one person or association of persons in any one coal field for a period of not exceeding 10 years, on such conditions not inconsistent with this act as in his opinion will safeguard the public interest, without payment of royalty for the coal mined or for the land occupied: *Provided*, That the acquisition or holding of a lease under the preceding sections of this act shall be no bar to the acquisition, holding, or operating under the limited license in this section permitted. And the holding of such a license shall be no bar to the acquisition or holding of such a lease or interest therein.

"Sec. 11. That any lease, entry, location, occupation, or use permitted under this act shall reserve to the Government of the United States the right to grant or use such easements in, over,

through, or upon the land leased, entered, located, occupied, or used as may be necessary or appropriate to the working of the same or other coal lands by or under authority of the Government and for other purposes: *Provided*, That said Secretary, in his discretion, in making any lease under this act, may reserve to the United States the right to lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of the surface of the lands embraced within such lease under existing law or laws hereafter enacted in so far as said surface is not necessary for use by the lessee in extracting and removing the deposits of coal therein. If such reservation is made, it shall be so determined before the offering of such lease.

"That the said Secretary during the life of the lease is authorized to issue such permits for easements herein provided to be reserved, and to permit the use of such other public lands in the Territory of Alaska as may be necessary for the construction and maintenance of coal washeries or other works incident to the mining or treatment of coal, which lands may be occupied and used jointly or severally by lessees or permittees, as may be determined by said Secretary.

"Sec. 12. That no lease issued under authority of this act shall be assigned or sublet except with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior. Each lease shall contain provisions for the purpose of insuring the exercise of reasonable diligence, skill, and care in the operation of said property, and for the safety and welfare of the miners and for the prevention of undue waste, including a restriction of the workday to not exceeding eight hours in any one day for underground workers except in cases of emergency; provisions securing the workers complete freedom of purchase, requiring the payment of wages at least twice a month in lawful money of the United States, and providing proper rules and regulations to secure fair and just weighing or measurement of the coal mined by each miner, and such other provisions as are needed for the protection of the interests of the United States, for the prevention of monopoly, and for the safeguarding of the public welfare.

"Sec. 13. That the possession of any lessee of the land or coal deposits leased under this act for all purposes involving adverse claims to the leased property shall be deemed the possession of the United States, and for such purposes the lessee shall occupy the same relation to the property leased as if operated directly by the United States.

"Sec. 14. That any such lease may be forfeited and canceled by appropriate proceeding in a court of competent jurisdiction whenever the lessee fails to comply with any provision of the lease or of general regulations promulgated under this act; and the lease may provide for the enforcement of other appropriate remedies for breach of specified conditions thereof.

"Sec. 15. That on and after the approval of this act no lands in Alaska containing deposits of coal withdrawn from entry or sale shall be disposed of or acquired in any manner except as provided in this act: *Provided*, That the passage of this act shall not affect any proceeding now pending in the Department of the Interior, and any such proceeding may be carried to a final determination in said department notwithstanding the passage hereof: *Provided further*, That no lease shall be made, under the provisions hereof, of any land, a claim for which is pending in the Department of the Interior at the date of the passage of this act, until and unless such claim is finally disposed of by the department adversely to the claimant.

"Sec. 16. That all statements, representations, or reports required, unless otherwise specified, by the Secretary of the Interior under this act shall be upon oath and in such form and upon such blanks as the Secretary of the Interior may require, and any person making false oath, representation, or report shall be subject to punishment as for perjury.

"Sec. 17. That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe the necessary and proper rules and regulations and to do any and all things necessary to carry out and accomplish the purposes of this act.

"Sec. 18. That all acts and parts of acts in conflict herewith are hereby repealed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

SCOTT FERRIS,
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
WM. L. LA FOLLETTE,
Managers on the part of the House.
H. L. MYERS,
WM. H. THOMPSON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT.

Section 1 of the bill as agreed to in conference authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to survey and lease the coal lands in

Alaska, giving preference, so far as early surveys are concerned, to the three main fields, to wit, the Bering River field, the Matanuska field, and the Nenana field, appropriating \$100,000 for the making of the necessary surveys preliminary to the leasing of the lands. This appropriation was not carried in the House bill, but upon investigation it was deemed necessary to be made.

Section 2 authorizes the President of the United States to make reservations for the use of the Federal Government not exceeding 5,120 acres in the Bering River field and not to exceed 7,680 acres in the Matanuska field, and limiting the reservations to be made by the Government in other fields in Alaska to an area not exceeding one-half of the coal fields. The proviso to the section authorizes the President, in the case of an emergency, or when he deems it necessary, to mine coal for the benefit of the Army and Navy or the operation of the Government railroads. It likewise gives him that authority if monopoly and oppressive conditions prevail there.

Section 3 authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to divide the coal-bearing areas into leasing blocks of 40 acres or multiples thereof, and to offer them for lease by competitive bidding or such other method as the Secretary of the Interior may provide. The second proviso of the section provides that no railroads shall be permitted to own or hold a lease other than for its own exclusive use. The third proviso of the section authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make arrangements whereby the Alaskan coal claimants may relinquish any and all rights they may have to a patent under old law, and if, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, the circumstances connected with such relinquishment justify so doing, the moneys paid by the claimants shall be refunded by the Government to the claimants. This is left wholly within the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, and it is thought no harm can come from it and great good may be derived therefrom in cases where it may be the means of clearing up a lot of troublesome litigation that has heretofore found no adequate solution. The last proviso also directs that all claims now pending before the General Land Office and the Department of the Interior shall be adjudicated within one year from the passage of this act. This is only required when the cases have been fully submitted and are now before the department for adjudication. The Department of the Interior was consulted on this proposition, and your conferees were advised that this would give ample time to accomplish the findings required and it would in no way hazard or interfere with the administration of the coal lands in Alaska.

Section 4 is practically identical with the House provision. Section 5 was a paragraph incorporated by the Senate, which was thought to be in the interest of good administration and was thought would accomplish development of the coal fields in Alaska. Section 17 of the bill as it emerged from conference authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to work out rules and regulations which will make the section workable.

Section 6 provides that each lease shall be for such block or tract of land as may be offered or applied for, not exceeding in area 2,560 acres of land, providing how the lease may be forfeited, except that any such ownership and interest hereby forbidden which may be acquired by descent, will, judgment, or decree may be held for two years, and not longer, after its acquisition.

Section 7 is identical with section 7 of the House bill.

Sections 8 and 8a are antimonopoly provisions which were thought to be in the public interest. They should be considered in connection with section 6 of the House bill, which sought to deal with the same problem.

Section 9 deals with the royalties and fixes the minimum at 2 cents per ton, striking out the maximum of 5 cents per ton which was incorporated in the Senate bill. The annual acreage rental being retained in the bill as it emerged from conference is substantially the same as the House and Senate bills. The latter part of section 9 fixes the term of lease at 50 years, the House section fixing it for an indeterminate period, with power to revise the royalty every 20 years. The 50-year provision is in harmony with the water-power bill and the general leasing bill for the United States, and in any event the Secretary of the Interior has full power to incorporate a provision in the lease providing how the royalty may be readjusted, and section 17 also gives him ample power under rules and regulations to readjust the royalty.

It will be observed that the last paragraph of section 9 of the Senate bill was not carried in the House bill. It is as follows:

"All net profits from operation of Government mines, and all royalties and rentals under leases as herein provided, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States in a separate and

distinct fund to be applied to the reimbursement of the Government of the United States on account of any expenditures made in the construction of railroads in Alaska, and the excess shall be deposited in the fund known as the Alaska fund, established by the act of Congress of January 27, 1905, to be expended as provided in said last-mentioned act."

It is thought by your conferees that this provision fully protects the Federal Government from the fact that it specifically recites that the revenues derived from coal leases shall be applied to the reimbursement of the Government on account of the appropriation made for the construction of railroads in Alaska. This provision is thought to be in the public interest and in harmony with the Alaskan railroad bill already passed. It will also be noted that after the railway appropriation is disposed of or offset by accruing royalties the residue, if any there be, shall be used according to the act of Congress approved January 27, 1905, providing how the receipts from Alaskan revenues shall be expended.

Section 10 of the bill as it emerged from conference corresponds with section 8 of the House bill, with a slight omission. The exact words omitted are:

"Provided, That not more than one such limited license or permit shall be issued to any single applicant hereunder."

It is thought this provision is a repetition, and therefore unnecessary. It is also capable of being fully taken care of under general regulations.

Section 11 corresponds with section 9 of the House bill and does not depart therefrom in any substantial particular.

Section 12 is identical with section 10 of the House bill.

Section 13 of the bill emerging from conference is a salutary provision which found a place both in the House and Senate bills.

Section 14 is identical with section 11 of the House bill.

Section 15 is identical with the House provision of section 15 of the House bill down to the second proviso. The second proviso of section 15 as the bill emerged from conference was incorporated in lieu of section 15 of the Senate bill, which was stricken out. Your conferees feel sure the substitution is in the public interests and one that will meet with approval of both bodies.

Section 16 of the bill emerging from conference is identical with section 12 of the House bill and identical with section 16 of the Senate bill.

Section 17 is identical with sections 17 of the House and Senate bills, respectively.

Section 18 of the bill emerging from conference merely repeals all acts and parts of acts in conflict herewith. It is the thought of your conferees that this should be done.

It is the thought of your conferees, first, that the bill as it emerged from conference retains the substantial features of the House bill; second, that it is workable, and that the Secretary of the Interior can proceed to lease the lands that have heretofore been tied up for eight long years; third, that the competitive plan adopted has been retained in the bill and will enable the Secretary of the Interior to derive revenues that may be applied on the Alaskan railway appropriation; fourth, that the bill is one in the public interest, and does not forfeit or sacrifice any rights of the Federal Government to the Alaskan coal claimants; fifth, that the legislation does not do violence or injustice to the Alaskan coal claimants, but leaves them in statu quo; sixth, that the Secretary of the Interior is given ample authority to make large reserves for the benefit of the Government so that the Army and Navy may have an indeterminate fuel supply; seventh, that the appropriation carried by the bill for surveys is necessary in order that the leasing may go on and the emergency that exists in Alaska be relieved; eighth, that the legislation as it emerges from conference has left full discretion in the Secretary of the Interior to protect the public interests and at the same time leave the measure workable so the opening of Alaska may be possible and good results flow therefrom.

Respectfully submitted.

SCOTT FERRIS,
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
WM. L. LA FOLLETTE,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for a question?

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. What is the part in the first conference report which was left out of the second conference report?

Mr. FERRIS. There was one amendment that was put in in lieu of section 15 of the Senate bill. Section 15 of the Senate

bill in a word authorized the claimants to sue the Federal Government for any injury they might have or might think they had.

Mr. MANN. Where is that in the first conference report?

Mr. FERRIS. In our first conference report in lieu of section 15 we added a proviso to section 14 of the conference report bill, which was intended to serve in lieu of section 15 of the Senate bill. The conference agreed on that and made reports to the two Houses. The Senate objected to it because they thought it sacrificed some Government rights and interests, and after quite a prolonged debate of two days voted it down and sent it back to the conference committee.

Mr. MANN. They sustained the point of order.

Mr. FERRIS. They sustained the point of order; but in effect it amounted to rejecting the whole report. In the second conference report we omitted section 15 of the Senate bill and the proviso we added to section 14.

Mr. MANN. Can the gentleman read the portion of section 14 in the first conference report?

Mr. FERRIS. I will. It reads as follows:

Provided, That the possession of any lessee of any lands covered by his lease and the operation of the mines and other works thereon or the title of the products thereof shall not be interfered with by the Secretary of the Interior except after an appropriate proceeding in the district court of Alaska instituted for the purpose of securing a forfeiture or termination of such lease, and such forfeiture or termination shall take effect only from the date of entry of final judgment declaring such forfeiture or termination: *Provided further*, That such court proceedings must be instituted within 90 days after notice to the lessee of the facts constituting such cause of action, or the same shall be forever barred.

That was the language that the controversy came up over.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, and I ask for information, that provision would have foreclosed the right of the Government to end the lease by forfeiture for failure to carry out provisions of the lease, unless certain proceedings were instituted in the Federal court within a certain time?

Mr. FERRIS. That is true; it was a limitation on the Government.

Mr. MANN. I take it that the change is perfectly satisfactory to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], who was on the first conference committee.

Mr. FERRIS. I think I know the views of the gentleman from Wisconsin very well on the first conference, and I think this would be satisfactory to him, if he were here, although the last is merely a supposition.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has had no communication with the gentleman from Wisconsin as to the elimination?

Mr. FERRIS. No; I have not. I had a telegram from him on the first conference report.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman indicate whether there are any other changes in the second conference report from that first agreed upon?

Mr. FERRIS. I shall be happy to do that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice in reading the last conference report a material amendment, providing for the disposition of the funds arising from the rental and the royalty of coal lands.

Mr. FERRIS. That is true; that is a material amendment, and that was inserted in the last conference report. Does the gentleman want me to present the facts in regard to it? There are some other changes.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is an important one, and the gentleman may present it in his own order.

Mr. FERRIS. The first conference report did not contain the provision which I will read, but the last conference report does embody it. This language is inserted in the last conference report, but was omitted from the former report. It is found in section 9 of the Senate bill, beginning with the word "all":

All net profits from operation of Government mines, and all royalties and rentals under leases as herein provided, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States in a separate and distinct fund to be applied to the reimbursement of the Government of the United States on account of any expenditures made in the construction of railroads in Alaska, and the excess shall be deposited in the fund known as the Alaska fund, established by the act of Congress of January 27, 1905, to be expended as provided in said last-mentioned act.

That language passed the Senate, and the first conference committee were of the opinion that section 3 of the Alaskan railroad bill did all that was necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I recall section 3 of the Alaskan railroad bill, it provided that the funds should revert to the miscellaneous fund of the Treasury.

Mr. FERRIS. That is true. I have section 3 of the Alaskan bill, and it might be well to put it into the Record.

Mr. STAFFORD. The House did not specifically oppose the disposition of these funds?

Mr. FERRIS. That is true. We leave section 3 of the Alaskan railroad bill to govern. That was the action of the House, and that was the action of the first conference report; but the action of the Senate, of course, put in this other provision, and I think the gentleman will remember that the House debated somewhat whether they would put in that provision, but finally decided to stand on the proposition of section 3 of the Alaskan railroad bill. It is only a few lines, and I will read it:

SEC. 3. That all moneys derived from the lease, sale, or disposal of any of the public lands, including town sites, in Alaska, or the coal or mineral therein contained, or the timber thereon, and the earnings of said railroad or railroads, together with the earnings of the telegraph and telephone lines constructed under this act, above maintenance charges and operating expenses, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as other miscellaneous receipts are paid, and a separate account thereof shall be kept and annually reported to Congress.

That is the language of the Alaskan railroad bill, and, as I say, the House had intended to let that govern. However, there was some very strong insistence in the Senate that we first take the receipts from the coal and from the other revenues up there and pay for the Alaska railroad. Those Senators wanted to preserve the principle of not having the Federal Government go in and take all of the money out of the Territory after that, and after this is paid then step in and let what is known as the Alaska railway fund law apply and the receipts be disposed of in that manner then.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the Senate provision to which the House conferees agreed the second time virtually negative and nullify the provision adopted by the House in the Alaska railroad bill?

Mr. FERRIS. I really do not think it has any effect on it, only so far as coal leases are concerned. Section 3 of the Alaska railway bill applies to timber, oil, coal, mineral, and every available thing, and I think the only thing to modify it would be royalties from these leases, and our conference report does specifically say that these moneys shall all go into the Treasury until the railway appropriation is provided.

Mr. STAFFORD. And after that has been provided, then it shall go—

Mr. FERRIS. As per the Alaskan fund law.

Mr. STAFFORD. That does not go into the Treasury?

Mr. FERRIS. That is true; it does not.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, as I understand this new provision, money coming in from the rentals and royalties first go to reimburse the Government for expenditures on the Alaskan railroad, and I apprehend, as a matter of fact, that it will be several days, at least, before those funds are entirely reimbursed.

Mr. FERRIS. That is what we feared most.

Mr. MANN. But after that this establishes a principle which never has yet been adopted by Congress, that all of the money then coming in shall be expended in the Treasury for the benefit of the Territory, although in our recent bill I believe that we provided that only one-half should eventually go to the State.

Mr. FERRIS. I think the gentleman hardly intends to say that Congress has never done this specific thing, because, as a matter of fact, we only adverted to a law, a thing that Congress did do.

Mr. MANN. I know; but we never have yet disposed of these things in this way. This is an entirely new proposition.

Mr. FERRIS. But we did authorize the sale of Alaskan coal lands at \$10 an acre, and we did provide that those funds should go as the Alaskan fund provides, which, of course, is lots worse than this.

Mr. MANN. That is true enough. A certain amount of money has to be expended in Alaska, and probably this will never be excessive; but when we passed the general leasing bill we provided, first, that the funds should go into the reclamation fund, and then, when repaid by the reclamation fund, one-half, as I recall, should go to the State in lieu of taxation.

Mr. FERRIS. That is right.

Mr. MANN. This provides that in the end all of the money shall go for the benefit of the Territory. I believe the law provides how it shall be expended—schools, charity, roads, and so forth. Probably there will be time enough to change it before they reimburse the Government entirely for its expenditure on the Alaska railroad, but I doubt whether it is a good principle to adopt.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that he and I are not very far apart in our views in respect to that; but I will further say that they are mistaken who think that the pathway of the House conferees was strewn with roses. We could not have our way about all things.

Mr. MANN. That is true; and I have no desire to criticize the conferees; yet the first conference report was agreed to by the Senate conferees. It was not rejected by the Senate, except on a point of order relating to one item, and that item had been left out.

Mr. FERRIS. That is true.

Mr. MANN. I should have supposed that, leaving that item out for the benefit of the Senate, they would have still agreed to the other things they had formerly agreed to.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman's thoughts are traveling along the precise line they ought to travel; and I do not wonder that the gentleman says that we ought to have insisted upon that; but some of the strongest friends the bill had in the Senate said that we must preserve that principle or the bill would not go through. I think we have accomplished so much in other respects that we should be satisfied.

It will probably be 25 or 30 years, and maybe longer than that—maybe after we are all gone—before this Alaska railroad is paid for; and if we are right in that supposition, as the gentleman said, we will have plenty of time in which to correct an error, if it is an error, in that respect.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me, it is not material, probably, so far as Alaska is concerned; but it is very material, in my opinion, so far as the continental part of the United States is concerned, where we have the States. We passed a House bill in reference to the general leasing of coal and oil lands, and so forth, and there we determined that in the end one-half should go to the States in lieu of taxation. This principle now adopted here is that all of the money shall go to the States, if the States are put on even terms with the Territory; and, of course, if that coal bill passes the Senate, the western Senators will again insist that all of the money shall go to the Western States where the lands are located. I think these resources belong to the General Government, and when we pay to the State a reasonable amount in lieu of taxes we have done all they ought to ask us to do.

Mr. FERRIS. In reply to that, I will say I agree with the gentleman. I agree with his course of reasoning, I agree with his line of thought, and I agree with his suggestion. I think he has hit the nail right on the head; but, at the same time, it seems to me we ought to pass this law. Congress has heretofore said that the fund should be used in a certain way in Alaska. Now we step in and interrupt that proceeding that Congress had committed itself to by the act of June 27, 1905, long before I ever came to Congress.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. GOULDEN. I have listened with a great deal of interest to this discussion, and it struck me that the youngest man on the floor of this House, perhaps a man not yet born, who may come here as a Member of Congress, will never see a surplus arising in the direction which we are now discussing. The building of the proposed railroad in Alaska, in my judgment, will require all the funds available for the next half century.

Mr. FERRIS. That I fear; but we all hope for a more rosy view.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman kindly indicate if there are any other changes which the conferees agreed to which were not contained in the first conference report?

Mr. FERRIS. As the House is aware, it will be remembered that the first conference report was rejected by the Senate on the theory that we had exceeded our authority, and therefore with some precision we went through the bill in order to avoid anything subject to a point of order. So in section 14 of the conference report on the bill, section 14 of the Senate bill, which corresponds to section 11 of the House bill, we left out this language:

And the lease may provide the enforcement of other appropriate remedies for breach of specified conditions thereof.

So in this conference report that language is stricken out. Now, again we made one other change. There was an arbitration provision which passed both the House and the Senate, and our conference committee in the first instance inadvertently left it out. We reincorporated that the last time.

Mr. MANN. What section?

Mr. FERRIS. I will get it in just a moment. Section 11 of the House bill provided this language, among other things:

And the lease may provide for resort to appropriate methods for settlement of disputes or for remedies for breach of specified conditions thereof.

The Senate bill provided:

And the lease may provide for the enforcement of other appropriate remedies for breach of specified conditions thereof.

And we incorporated in the pending conference report that same thought carried—

Mr. MANN. What section of the conference report?

Mr. FERRIS. That was in section 11 of the House bill, corresponding to section 14 of the Senate bill, which now is incorporated in section 14 of the conferees' report on the bill. Then we put in section 12 in the last conference report the words "or sublet," which we had omitted from our first conference report and the Senate had omitted.

Mr. MANN. I do not find that provision of section 14 of the conference report. Can the gentleman state what section it is in?

Mr. STAFFORD. Section 14.

Mr. FERRIS. We add that language to section 14.

Mr. MANN. I do not read it in section 14.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is just before the proviso. The clause before the proviso, section 14, is what the gentleman refers to.

Mr. FERRIS. That is it.

Mr. MANN. There is nothing in that about arbitration.

Mr. FERRIS. "And the lease may provide for the enforcement of other appropriate remedies for breach of specified conditions thereof." It does not say on the face of it it means arbitration, but the conferees took the Senate provision whereby we put it within the power of the Secretary of the Interior to incorporate a provision of that kind. That is our thought. Now, unless somebody desires some time on either side—

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FERRIS. Certainly.

Mr. RAKER. I desire to ask the gentleman with reference to the last section, 18. What is the thought of the committee with reference to that section?

Mr. FERRIS. Section 18?

Mr. RAKER. The repealing clause in the bill. It reads:

That all acts and parts of acts in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Mr. FERRIS. This is the thought: Section 18 of the Senate bill as it passed the Senate, as the gentleman knows, is to repeal the provision with reference to irrigation, and it was the thought of the conferees that we ought not to deal with that matter on this bill, however advisable it may be. I personally would be in favor of repealing it, which could be done at any time, but we did not think we ought to put in a provision providing for the repeal of acts of Congress.

Upon the examination of the Alaskan coal lands that have been made applicable to that Territory it developed that they did not have any appraisalment law at all, and the only thing that could be done up there, if this bill served as a restoration of all these lands, was to sell them at a flat \$10-an-acre rate.

Mr. RAKER. This repealing division then applies solely to the laws as applying to Alaska?

Mr. FERRIS. And only so far as they are in conflict with this.

Mr. RAKER. Only so far as they are in conflict with this present bill?

Mr. FERRIS. That is all.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the House would be interested in having the gentleman point out with some emphasis that the conferees did not agree to the absolute royalty basis that was inserted in the Senate for the mining of the coal, but the House conferees retained the original House provision of making it not less than 2 cents a ton.

Mr. FERRIS. I should be very glad to devote a moment to that. As the House well remembers, we had before us and considered very carefully the advisability of trying to place any maximum on the amount to be charged for coal, and the House, I think, was almost a unit on the proposition that we should not. So the House bill provided for the competitive plan of disposing of the coal, with a minimum provision of 2 cents, but no maximum, to the end that the Secretary of the Interior could use his best energies to get all he could for the coal. As the bill passed the Senate they incorporated a provision in it like this, that the minimum royalty shall be 2 cents a ton and the maximum royalty shall be 5 cents a ton. It was the very earnest thought of the House conferees that no such provision as that ought to be incorporated in the law. For instance, what shape would Congress be in, and how could Congress defend, and how could Congress reply, with even good faith, when one coal company offered 10 cents a ton and another offered 12 cents a ton, and another offered 15 cents a ton, when there was a positive prohibition in the law that the Secretary of the Interior could only charge 5 cents a ton royalty? And so the conferees were very steadfast in their opinion on that, and the Senate yielded, and that went out of the bill. So it was neither in this conference report nor in the last, and I feel sure it should not be in either one of them.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like about 10 minutes.
Mr. FERRIS. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming. Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, there are two features of this Alaskan bill that I desire to discuss briefly. One of them relates to the very important and, it seems to me, significant fact that the Alaska coal bill as it will become a law does not contain any provisions whatever for the protection of the consumer or the user of Alaskan coal, unless such protection may be secured by and through contracts or by and through stipulations in the contract entered into by the Secretary of the Interior and the lessee. It is true there are very indefinite and not very effective provisions in the bill that it might be said were intended to give some protection to the consumer of these coals. We began the discussion of this question of retaining the Alaskan coal lands in public ownership rather than passing title, on the theory that a transfer into private ownership would lead to monopoly, and that it might not be possible under such a system to fully protect the purchaser of that coal from unfair prices; from absolute refusal to sell the product to certain parties; from all of those unfair practices from which people have so frequently suffered in this country. It was said, I think, at the time the matter was under discussion in the House, and when I offered several amendments intended to regulate and control the disposition of these products, that it would all be taken care of under general laws, and there was a section 3 in the so-called antitrust bill as it passed the House, which would have punished an attempt to monopolize or unfair practices in the sale of these products, but, lo and behold, when the conferees took possession of that bill and gave it an anesthetic, and then performed a dental operation, and removed all of its teeth, section 3 evaporated into thin air, went out, and became as though it never had been.

So here we are at the end of all this talk with regard to the Alaskan coal situation just exactly where we were before, so far as any protection to the general public that may desire to purchase and use these coals is concerned. No better off in that respect than we would have been under private ownership. This is a beautiful sample of a legislative "ring around the rosy"—talk, talk, talk, discussion, loud insistence upon the protection of the public. After we get all through with it the public is just where it was before, and absolutely without any additional protection whatever. Even the protection of a general statute, which we would have had, had section 3 remained in the antitrust bill, is denied us, and these lessees can monopolize as much as an owner could have monopolized, can proceed to unfair practices just as much as an individual owner could, unless by some process not clearly understood by me the Secretary of the Interior may be able, in the form of a contract, to restrain that sort of thing. I doubt if he will ever be able to do it. So much for that.

There is another very significant feature of this Alaskan legislation. Alaska is a Territory. We ought to care for her and care for her people quite as well as we care for the people in the States. We ought to guard their interests quite as much, but no more. What is fair in Alaska touching the public lands and touching the utilization of the products and the revenues from public lands ought to be fair within the confines of the States. In Alaska we give the Territory all of the proceeds of leases, every dollar of them. Some of it is to be spent in the building of railroads in Alaska, and the balance is to be utilized for the building of roads, care of the insane, education, and other purposes, as provided by the legislation creating the Alaskan fund. That is the situation in Alaska. It is a just and proper provision. It is just as it should be.

But what did we do with regard to the States of the Union, the Commonwealths of the Union, in the bill which we passed the other day? First, we repealed the sale laws, and therefore the States will not receive the 5 per cent on sales which they now receive. We repealed the provisions under which oil lands are sold and granted them free, so that the States are deprived of the 5 per cent on sales which they formerly received and the opportunity to tax the lands. Now when lands are sold they go on the tax lists, and the communities tax the lands and the properties for the purpose of building roads, maintaining schools, and paying for all the numberless expenses of a civilized and progressive government. But under the recent leasing legislation the State, while it loses the 5 per cent, while it loses the opportunity to tax these properties, does not receive a single solitary cent in lieu of that which it loses. The entire fund may be taken out of the State, beyond its boundaries hundreds and thousands of miles, and used elsewhere.

Of course there is a provision that ultimately 50 per cent of these funds, when they have been used in a reclamation project somewhere, if those dollars can be tagged so as to be identified and recognized when they return, shall be utilized for the bene-

fit of the communities and the States; but in the meantime, in the 20 or 25 or 30 years that may intervene, what are these communities going to do? Where are they to obtain the funds for the education of their children? From what source are they to secure the money necessary for the building of roads, hundreds of miles of them, that they must build right across these lands that are owned by the Government, and from which they will receive not a sou in the way of income?

No ranker injustice than that was ever proposed or suggested in any legislative body on earth, and I can not understand how gentlemen can bring themselves to agree to deprive the Western States of their largest and most important sources of income, and then turn right around, when it comes to Alaska, and provide that Alaska shall have the benefit of every dollar of the moneys received from the leasing of their lands.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have many dear friends on both sides of the aisle in this body and at both ends of the Capitol who feel a good deal as the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] does, and they think that we are going to do them a great violence and a great injustice. The real truth about it is, however, that we do so many good things for the West that I would be almost afraid to call attention to them for fear that by so doing the legislation might be defeated. I am not going to take up the time now to tell all the good things that this bill does for the West, but I will tell a few of them.

For the last eight years every acre of land in Alaska has been withdrawn from entry, and could not be used for any purpose. This bill authorizes the surface of the land to be used and entered for homes, the same as lands in Wyoming and elsewhere in the far West. That is benefit No. 1. No. 2 provides that the railroads shall pay their honest debts, which the Alaskan railroads agreed to pay. That is No. 2; and it provides, after that, that the proceeds may be used according to the law which I presume the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] assisted in passing through this House; a law which was passed and approved on January 27, 1905. It was passed before I came here.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman should understand that I am not criticizing what he has done in the case of Alaska. On the contrary I am approving it. I am only criticizing him and his colleagues because they have not done it with the States.

Mr. FERRIS. I will say to the gentlemen over there and to the gentlemen over here that if I thought this was an injustice to the West I would not be supporting this bill, because my heart and my interest and my affections are with the West. This bill does more for you out there in the West than you realize, and you ought to approve it. It permits the surface of the land to be used and entered as homes, and to be taxed by the local communities, and it does that in the general bill. Those lands are now tied up, and can not be used for any purpose.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him one moment further?

Mr. FERRIS. I regret I can not yield.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. FERRIS. I want to proceed a moment further. I would like to yield, and I do not want to be discourteous to the gentleman, but I want to proceed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma declines to yield.

Mr. FERRIS. Benefit No. 2: This coal is subject to taxation the moment it leaves the mouth of the mine, and your legislature can put an excise tax on the products of the mine and the States will derive that revenue.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from Wyoming?

Mr. FERRIS. Let me go a little further.

Mr. MONDELL. Just for a question.

Mr. FERRIS. I want to proceed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. FERRIS. Instead of having an outrage committed upon him, the gentleman is having an apron full of apples dumped into his lap. What would the gentleman's solution of this Alaskan problem be? Would the gentleman keep Alaska tied up for eight years more? Would the gentleman say that the coal land there should be sold at \$10 per acre, according to the existing law? Would the gentleman say that Secretary Lane ought to restore those lands to entry and let the scandal and riot and trouble arise in Alaska again? I know he would not.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman does not want to misstate my position, I am sure. I voted for the gentleman's bill. I propose to vote for the conference report.

Mr. FERRIS. I am not at all nettled by the gentleman's remarks. I am really very glad to hear from him. But the gentleman is particularly caustic in his attacks, in his savage attacks, on this legislation. My service and the service of my colleagues on the Committee on the Public Lands has been an unselfish one from A to Z. What does any member of the committee on the Democratic side, and what does any member of the committee on the Republican side, and what does the Progressive member of the committee profit by working a year, almost, in getting through some legislation that will actually open up Alaska?

I call the attention of my Democratic colleagues to the fact that there is no one here who would want this Congress to adjourn, after making a \$35,000,000 appropriation for railroads in Alaska, and still leave the coal lands up there tied up. Is there any gentleman over here on this side or over there on that side who would like to enlist under the banner of the gentleman from Wyoming, whose party's program for Alaska looks to no opening up of that vast region? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Eight long years since the lands were withdrawn have elapsed, and you can not now get enough coal even to put in a stove for fire as the result of the program of the gentleman's party. I freely give the gentleman from Wyoming the credit of bringing into this House a bill four years ago—I think it was four years ago—

Mr. MONDELL. Three years ago—

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; and I joined with him in trying to get some relief for Alaska. We followed his plan then. I voted with him in his efforts to give relief to Alaska. The gentleman was then chairman of the committee and I was a private on the committee. I threw no obstacle in his way. I stood side by side and shoulder to shoulder with him and tried to get that bill through. What happened? The House virtually rolled us up in a ball and tossed us unceremoniously out of the window. We did not get enough votes to know that we were even in the running. What happened? Myself and the 20 patriotic members of my committee joined hands and said, "We will try to pass a bill that will walk hand in hand with Judge Houston's bill, the Alaskan railroad appropriation bill." What did we do? We brought it in here. The House considered it. Republicans helped with it. Democrats helped with it. Everybody helped with it except the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. It went to the Senate. Nearly everybody helped with it there. It passed the Senate; it passed the conference. They did not even have a roll call on it when it passed the House. They did not even have a roll call on it when it passed the Senate. Everybody was for it but the gentleman from Wyoming. I do not want to say this, but I can not help but make an observation a little bit personal.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman should not say it, because he knows that that is not an accurate statement of the facts.

Mr. FERRIS. I will pause for the gentleman to tell wherein I falsify.

Mr. MONDELL. In the first place, I announced at the beginning of the debate that I was going to vote for the gentleman's bill, and I did vote for it.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes; but—

Mr. MONDELL. But that did not prevent my calling attention to its faults, to those things in which it failed to do the things you claimed you wanted to do.

Mr. FERRIS. Just a moment further. Yes; and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD makes comment more eloquent than the gentleman from Wyoming can ever make, when it shows that the gentleman threw every possible obstacle he could in the way of the bill. He offered dozens of amendments, some of them consisting of entire bills, some of them consisting of sections of old, discarded, bankrupt bills of his own. He was for it. He was like the man walking one way and looking the other. He was offering obstructive tactics from one end of the bill to the other, and still saying he was for it. Let me make the observation I intended to make a moment ago. It may be a little personal or it may not. I may be in error and I may not; but when I look at the Speaker of this House I call attention to the fact that he used to be a prominent member of the Ways and Means Committee, and I find him helping that committee, pushing and helping to make that committee successful.

I look on the Republican side and I find the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who used to be chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I find him helping and aiding that committee, trying to make it successful. I find the Speaker trying to make the committee to which he formerly belonged successful. I find the gentleman from Illinois trying to make the committee to which he formerly belonged successful. I find him offering every aid to Judge ADAMSON in his committee; and fond as I may be of my friend from Wyoming, and

much as I cherish his opinion, I find him rather lagging in his tent, rather pulling back on his halter, instead of rising to the statesmanship and patriotism that the Speaker does and that the gentleman from Illinois does. I find the gentleman from Wyoming retarding the bill, pulling back instead of pressing forward, and throwing obstacles in our way. I did not intend to say this. I want to say to the gentleman now that any way I can render a little aid, any way I can render a little service toward the development of the West, where every cent and every interest I have on earth is located, I shall do it; and if the fortunes of politics should sweep us from our feet and again sweep the gentleman into power, I will be at his back trying to help him accomplish good things for the West. The gentleman does not know how it sounds when he comes in here and utters word, fantastic statements that do not even hold together. They are not what he intends to say.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman to give me five minutes. He has seen fit to attack me. I think I am entitled to a little time.

Mr. FERRIS. I yield the gentleman five minutes. I hope he will not take much more time, because I do not want to get into a colloquy with the gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. It is no argument; it is no answer; it never was since time began and it never will be until all things end, to reply to an argument with personal criticism. The gentleman has not referred to or answered the just and proper criticisms I have made of the bill. Now, I like the gentleman from Oklahoma. He and I have worked together here for years, and generally in harmony. He was against the Alaskan railroad bill and so was I, but he criticizes me because I opposed some features of this bill. Is he not subject to the same criticism for opposing as vigorously as he did the bill brought in by his party for the building of an Alaskan railroad? It is no answer to my criticism to say that I have been vigorously and continuously opposed to certain features of the bill. I have not been an obstructionist on this bill. I offered amendments that, in my opinion, would have helped the bill, some of which were adopted. I offered amendments that were intended to protect the purchasers of these products; they were rejected. There is not a line or a syllable in the bill that affords such protection. It does not answer my argument to say that I have been opposed to some of the provisions of the bill. I shall vote for the conference report as I voted for the bill, but I vote for it fully realizing its faults and determined to point them out. I fully realize what the bill lacks, but I am anxious to do something to help open the coal of Alaska to use. I am always glad to join with the gentleman from Oklahoma, and in the main he and I have been in agreement; but he must not criticize me because I object to things that in my opinion, whatever may be his opinion, are subject to criticism.

Mr. FERRIS. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN] have three minutes—not on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can yield time.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman from New York does not want to speak on the bill.

Mr. GOULDEN. It affects the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may have three minutes—not on the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps what I have here may throw oil on the troubled waters between the two distinguished gentlemen from the West, both of whom are my personal friends. Therefore I ask the indulgence of the House to read it. It is entitled "Out Where the West Begins." It has been my privilege to have traveled over this country extensively, and having a great many friends in the West, of whom I am very fond, and as the subject before the House deals with that section, I think it deserves a place in the records of Congress about this time. The poem, the author being unknown to me, is entitled:

OUT WHERE THE WEST BEGINS.

Out where the hand clasps a little stronger,
Out where the smile dwells a little longer—
That's where the West begins.

Out where the sun's a little brighter,
Where the snow that falls is a trifle whiter,
Where the bonds of home are a wee bit tighter—
That's where the West begins.

Out where the skies are a trifle bluer,
Out where friendship's a little truer,
Out where everything is newer—
That's where the West begins.

Out where a fresher breeze is blowing,
Where there's laughter in every streamlet flowing,
Where there's more of reaping and less of sowing—
That's where the West begins.

Out where the West is in the making,
Where fewer hearts with despair are aching,
Where there's more of giving and less of taking—
That's where the West begins.

Where there's more of singing and less of sighing,
Where there's more of giving and less of buying,
And a man makes friends without half trying—
That's where the West begins.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. FERRIS, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER SATURDAY.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I understand that a number of Members desire to leave the city on Saturday, some of whom have to return to their homes to register. The program of the House is about completed, except when the revenue bill comes back. I have no desire to keep Members here, and I know that it is necessary for them to be in their districts at this time. All I have to ask is that when the revenue bill does come back Members will furnish a quorum to expedite that measure, and I would like to first ask that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next. Monday is unanimous-consent day, and I think it is advisable that we do not adjourn over that day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-morrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 601.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 649.

Resolved, That House resolution 601 directing the Sergeant at Arms to enforce section 40 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is hereby repealed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offered that resolution as the proponent of the original resolution. It was necessary when the original resolution was passed to maintain a quorum in the House. At the present time business is not pressing, and I believe the membership of the House are willing to respond when the revenue bill comes back. In the meantime there may be some days in which the Members can go to their districts, and I do not think they ought to be penalized when they return to their constituency with an election just coming on.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask if the adoption of this resolution contemplates the repeal of that statute?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; it does not; it could not.

Mr. HENRY. I would like to see the statute repealed, and if there is any way to get up a bill to repeal it I would like to see it done. I do not want to embarrass the resolution presented by the gentleman from Alabama, but I would like to have such a bill considered by unanimous consent.

Mr. MANN. May I make a suggestion to the gentleman?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield.

Mr. MANN. I think possibly if the distinguished gentleman from Texas, chairman of the Committee on Rules, would report a rule for immediate consideration of such a repealing bill that the rule would pass.

Mr. HENRY. Personally, committing myself to the proposition now, I would like to see the statute repealed to-day. I am ready to do it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will say this: So far as the statute is concerned, I think this House should have control of its Members, but I do not believe that there ought to be a final repeal of the statute entirely. I think the statute works too great a hardship. I think it ought to be amended so as to only invoke the penalty against a Member when he is absent without leave of the House. That would give the House the right to grant leave to any Member that had a good excuse and yet exercise the power of the House to bring the man back.

Mr. HENRY. I do not want to embarrass the gentleman from Alabama, but I would like to say that it may be necessary next week to have a quorum on some other matters beside the war-revenue measure.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say that so far as I am concerned when there is business before the House I shall exercise all the power I have to furnish a quorum, but I do not want to embarrass Members at this time.

Mr. HENRY. I do not want to sit here silent and let Members think that there may not be any necessity for a quorum early next week.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman give us any idea about when the revenue bill may come to the House?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not; it depends on the debate in the Senate. I do not think it will get back to the House before the middle of next week.

Mr. RAKER. Take my case. It takes me five or six days to get home. Suppose I start home, and next week you are without a quorum and an order for arrest is issued, would I be arrested and brought back?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman would be if the Sergeant at Arms could catch him; but if the gentleman was a day ahead he could not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from California that I do not see that the order would very much relieve his situation, being so far away from home; but it will relieve a number of gentlemen who are only 24 or 36 hours away.

Mr. RAKER. I want to put my case plainly. I am going to have it fixed now, because it is very important to me. The rule, I suppose, should be applied to all, and it would be the duty of the Sergeant at Arms to serve his warrant of arrest, and it would be my duty to come back from California in order to preserve a quorum?

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I realize that, in justice to this House, many Members probably ought to go to their districts before the election. I have recently told Members on this side of the House that I thought they were at liberty to go home, with the understanding that if necessary to make a quorum those who were near enough should come back when this side of the House asked them to. As far as I am concerned, under the circumstances, while I may not be in favor of the proposition before the House, I would do everything I could to have Republicans enough present to make their share of a quorum so that the House might transact its business.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the gentleman if he thinks it will be possible to secure a quorum within 24 hours after it may be necessary to have one here?

Mr. MANN. I can not say whether it would be 24 hours or 48 hours, but I think it is quite possible to secure a quorum within a very short time.

Mr. HENRY. I want to be fair about it. The gentleman understands that I am in hopes that we can have legislation on the cotton situation.

Mr. MANN. I agree with the gentleman. I hope we will have legislation to relieve the cotton situation.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if the Members from the far West, who have been here all of the time, who did not even go home during the interim between the conclusion of the regular session and the beginning of the extra session—that is, between the 4th of March and the 7th of April—about 20 of us, who have helped make a quorum here for a year and a half, could not be excused now and be permitted to go home and not required to come back to make a quorum during the rest of the session?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would take my advice on the subject, I would advise him to go home and not to pay any attention to any request the Sergeant at Arms might make to him. The Sergeant at Arms may not be permitted to make a discrimination, but the gentleman from the far West will not be needed to come back to make a quorum before the election, because we can get a quorum otherwise.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama when he thinks Congress may finally adjourn?

Mr. MANN. When will the European war end? [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As far as I can tell, I do not think the revenue bill will be back to the House before the middle of next week. If it comes back by Wednesday, I do not believe it will be possible to adjourn before Saturday week.

Mr. HENRY. The gentleman really thinks it may be Saturday week before we adjourn?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think it can be before then.

Mr. HENRY. If he does, then I have nothing further to say.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think we can adjourn before that time.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Is it the general consent of the House after this is through that I may be excused from attendance on the House during the rest of the session?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. That might be the gentleman's view, but I know he does not mean it. My Republican friend can not get rid of me that easy.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I think we ought to have the presence of the gentleman from California as much as possible during his limited stay here.

Mr. RAKER. I want to say that I have been attending to my duty for months, when the gentleman who made the remark about my being excused has been away for months.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from California has been here so long that it is getting on his nerves.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. Does the gentleman from Alabama have any doubts about the ability of the House to get a quorum here without a great deal of trouble in the event this resolution is repealed at this time?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no doubts about it. If I thought there were any doubts about the Members coming back to furnish a quorum to pass the revenue bill I would not ask for this repeal, and I will say farther to the gentleman that if they do not come back I shall offer another resolution proposing the same thing as I did before, but I think they will come back.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. CRISP. Will this repeal have any effect on reimbursing those Members whose salaries have been docked under the power of the resolution?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not at all.

Mr. CRISP. Personally I would like to see them reimbursed. It does not affect me.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the repealing of this resolution have a retroactive effect so as to save former absentees?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I suppose it would for this month.

Mr. BRYAN. Does not the gentleman think that this is an unheard of and preposterous statute, which can be suspended at will, put up or down, according to the will of the majority?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I agree with the gentleman about that.

Mr. BRYAN. It is a preposterous proceeding that a statute may be a law when we want it and not a law when we do not want it. It seems to me a serious thing to suspend the enforcement of a law, if it is in truth a law.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. BARTON. Before the resolution is passed I want to know if the passage of it relieves the Sergeant at Arms from making a deduction that the former resolution called for?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It would so far as this month is concerned.

Mr. MANN. It leaves it to the Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; and I have no doubt that he will use wise discretion.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman stated that he thought the law ought to be amended so that leave of the House would be a valid excuse.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. A great many Members were absent under leave of the House when the resolution was passed on August 25, and they immediately returned, but pending the time for them to reach here by the usual and most rapid method of travel they were absent a day or two.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that I do not think now is a very auspicious time to hold a post mortem.

Mr. PADGETT. Would the gentleman object to an amendment to his resolution to provide that it should be operative from August 25 last?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, I do not think that would do now.

Mr. MANN. That would not have any effect. I would further suggest to the Members of the House that the repeal of this resolution will not deprive any Member of the House of the right to make a certificate to the Sergeant at Arms that he was absent, in accordance with the provision of that section of the law, and is not entitled to his pay for the time that he has been absent. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, I call for a division. I will not vote to suspend the enforcement of a law. We put it on with a roll call; now let us put it off with a roll call.

Mr. BUTLER. Do not let us do anything of the kind; let us all get away from here.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, I call for a division, and I am going to vote no.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 81, noes 8.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FERRIS. If this House passes a resolution at this time to the effect that the sense of this House was that the Sergeant at Arms should reimburse the salaries to the Members who have lost them, would he be compelled to do it?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it would take a joint resolution to do it.

Mr. FERRIS. It ought to be done.

The SPEAKER. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. [Cries of "Regular order!"] Under the rule, this being Calendar Wednesday, the House resolves itself automatically into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand that my request that when we adjourn on Friday we adjourn to meet on Monday is agreed to?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the conclusion of the speeches of Mr. MANN and Mr. UNDERWOOD, I be given 30 minutes to make an address to the House on rural credits, especially to discuss two bills, one framed by the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the report made by the United States commission, confining my remarks to those two bills.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that to-morrow, after the hour granted to the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Illinois each has been concluded, he shall be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on the subject of rural credits, the speech to be confined to that subject. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE. Is the gentleman's request merely to make an address?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be excused from further attendance on the House for the next three weeks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that he be excused from attendance on the House for three weeks. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY—REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF PRINTING LAWS.

The SPEAKER. The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 15902, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] will take the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15902, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15902) to amend, revise, and codify the laws relating to public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 69. PAR. 2. The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of the proceedings of Congress shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semi-monthly during the sessions of Congress and promptly at the close thereof, and for a table of contents in each issue of the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana will remember I took up some time ago with the Joint Committee on Printing the question of whether it would be possible to have

the index to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD kept up to date so that you could find something, that index being now semimonthly, and that is what is appropriated for here.

Mr. BARNHART. I did not get the gentleman's question.

Mr. MANN. I think we print the index now every two weeks, but this says semimonthly. But is it not every two weeks?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; every two weeks.

Mr. MANN. We print the index to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD every two weeks with a table of contents, and if you want to know whether a thing passed last summer, April, May, or June, you can not find it without looking through all the indexes for that period unless you are lucky enough to strike it the first time. But if you want to know whether a certain thing has been done during this session of Congress, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD index furnishes very little information unless you sift through all the indexes. We have now had a session of Congress running nine months. When I took up this matter with the Joint Committee on Printing some time ago I asked what figures they could give, and they gave very large figures for keeping the index current like it is when the final index is finished. I do not know if there is any way of doing that without great expense, but to gentlemen who have occasion now to look up legislation that has taken place at this session of Congress the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD index is of very little value unless you know about the date.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is the index as prepared now paid for on the item basis?

Mr. MANN. I do not know how it is paid for.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. My impression is it must be.

Mr. MANN. I think not.

Mr. BARNHART. It is paid for on the page basis.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In a long session like this that is equivalent to a good bonus during this Congress.

Mr. MANN. Why?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If in the last Congress payment to the indexer was a very considerable sum, this session it will be far in excess over the other—a very handsome profit, indeed, and a sum of money probably to justify an index in daily form.

Mr. MANN. I think the expense referred to by the Committee on Printing when I took the matter up was not the expense of making the index, but the expense of printing and paper. I am sorry I have not the letter here.

Mr. BARNHART. I have the letter. Would the gentleman like to have it read?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. It says:

The cost of printing 30,000 copies of the Index and the History of Bills and Resolutions in the present form, as it is now printed, is \$29,348.20.

The cost of printing 30,000 copies of accumulative Index and History of Bills and Resolutions, complete every two weeks, would be \$181,123.40.

The cost of printing the same number of copies of accumulative Index without the History of Bills and Resolutions every two weeks would be \$120,930.60.

The cost of printing 575 copies of a cumulative Index and History of Bills and Resolutions every two weeks for congressional use and 29,425 copies of Index and History of bills and Resolutions in the present form for subscribers would be \$90,825.79.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does that include the editing?

Mr. BARNHART. No. It would not cost any more for editing. The same editorial force would likely do the work.

Mr. MANN. I think this is largely for paper.

Mr. BARNHART. Paper and resetting type. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the information of the committee is that it would require resetting continually, and the printing, binding, and so forth, additional.

Mr. MANN. I do not know why it would require any large amount of resetting—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Of course it would require a change in the forms, and perhaps that would require more or less resetting to bring it down to date. Of course I do not think it would be worth while to go to the expense of \$100,000 extra to have the index. Probably it would not be necessary if you had an index and sent it out to all the subscribers; but there ought to be some way by which Members of Congress can keep track of what has been done at this session of Congress. You can

go and get the Index for the last session of Congress—and that is complete—and look up the Record, but if you want to find what has been done at this session of Congress you can not do it without a large amount of labor, looking through a whole lot of semiweekly or semimonthly indexes. I do not know as there is any way to do it otherwise. Perhaps I make more use of it than most of the Members, and it would be cheaper to give me an extra clerk—which I am not going to ask for—to have matters looked up. But the present method is a very unsatisfactory one where you have a long session of Congress.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. BARNHART. The committee fully realizes all that the gentleman from Illinois has said.

Mr. MANN. I understand.

Mr. BARNHART. We have gone into it from every possible angle, and there seems to be no other way, and so far as the increased cost is concerned, I might say the difficulty about that is that there are so many corrections that it virtually means resetting the entire index every time it is changed, and it must be changed, as a matter of course, in order to keep it up to date. Now, all the committee has is the estimate and the word of the Public Printer and those who have had charge of this work for all of these years. We asked them to give us an intelligent plan by which this might be changed, and they said there was no plan except the one suggested by the gentleman from Illinois, and the cost of that was so colossal that the committee decided it would not recommend it.

Mr. MANN. I agree with the committee that the cost that was presented seemed larger than the value of the additional work, unless it could be printed in only a small number; that is, if the principal cost was paper. But possibly that is not the case—it might be resetting—but so that there might be some index by Members of Congress, at least. I thought possibly we could just add a line and insert.

Mr. BARNHART. They say not. They say it means resetting continuously, practically, and that is what makes the cost so high. That and the paper make the cost. The composition is quite expensive.

Mr. MANN. There are several things that the Congress can do which would very greatly expedite the work of Members in looking up things. Of course, you do not have anything to do with the indexing of the proceedings of the House. The index of the House, after the Senate bill as passed the House, does not show in the House index at all. And the man that has to look up something, as many of us have to do constantly, to see whether a bill has passed the House or not, finds it is almost impossible to do it unless you have a clear recollection. My memory is fairly good about legislative proceedings, and yet frequently I have to have somebody spend half a day to find something.

Mr. BARNHART. So far as the personal experience of the chairman of the committee is concerned, he learned after he had been here two or three years and worn his gray matter to a frazzle in trying to find things by the index, that about the shortest cut to it was to go to the document room and get somebody with a good recollection to give him information offhand. It is a complex situation, and it seems there ought to be some way to have it remedied, but how?

Mr. MANN. I frequently go to the document room for information, and about as frequently they come to me for information.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I believe that by the introduction of an amendment at the end of line 21, making it read "on a plan to be devised by the Public Printer," an indexing plan can be devised, the cost of which need not exceed the pay of two men at \$3,500 a year.

The index of bills passed can be devised and carried on and the RECORD can be indexed daily. The simply indexing of the daily RECORD can be done every night when the copy for the RECORD is cut out and assigned by indexing the RECORD in four sections—one for the Senate, and one for the House, and one for bills, and one for resolutions. Section 3 will cover bills and section 4 speeches, and a little calendar can be carried on the top, if the Public Printer is so requested, without any additional cost except that of a sheet of white paper—a sufficient index to enable Members of Congress and others to pick out the things in which they are particularly interested.

The matter of indexing has become an expert science. There are several large schools in the United States which teach library and other indexing, and I am satisfied, if the chairman will accept the amendment which I shall offer, giving the Public Printer the authority to devise that plan, that it can be carried out with little additional expense. I offer an amendment at the end of line 21, on page 90, to strike out the—

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, we have passed the section. The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk informs the Chair that he read down to page 91.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We are providing now for the daily indexing, are we not?

Mr. BARNHART. That is in section 69, paragraph 2, that we are now discussing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will withdraw my amendment, then, for the present.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 69. PAR. 4. No matter that is not germane to the business before either House, except such as shall be spoken in order, shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless specifically authorized by the respective House after having been referred to and reported upon by its Committee on Printing: *Provided*, That either House may grant a Member leave to print or extend his remarks in the RECORD upon a stated subject, but the matter so printed shall be germane to such subject and shall not, unless otherwise authorized, exceed four pages of the RECORD in length: *Provided further*, That no address or speech not delivered in either House, and no book, pamphlet, newspaper or magazine article, or document, except reports of committees, shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless read in order in either House or authorized by it after having been referred to and reported upon by its Committee on Printing.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. Here is a change in the practice of the House, proposed by this bill, which is revolutionary. There are now on the floor of the House 16 Members of the House; maybe 17. If this paragraph goes into the law and is observed, the four hundred-odd Members who are not present now will have all kinds of cat fits when they learn about it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Tell us about it now, so that we can have a little fit right at present. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. It will render my friend from Washington more anxious than ever to address the House [laughter], which he always does with grace and value to the House. But there are many Members of the House who insert speeches in the RECORD by permission. This morning by unanimous consent we authorized the insertion of a political speech made by the Speaker a few days ago. It is done every day. But under the provisions of this paragraph no extensions can be made or leaves to insert speeches can be granted unless they are not to exceed four pages in length and are germane to some particular subject when the request is asked for. You could not insert the speech of the Speaker; you could not insert a letter of the President; you could not insert anything unless the Committee on Printing had reported it into the House.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. FINLEY. Is not what is provided here substantially and theoretically, at least, what is the practice in the United States Senate to-day?

Mr. MANN. No; I beg the gentleman's pardon. The Senate of the United States, while it does not follow our practice about extension of remarks theoretically, in fact, it does in many cases, and there is more extraneous matter inserted in the RECORD in the Senate than there is in the House.

Mr. FINLEY. Well, now, just there, is not that usually stated to be, and as a matter of fact is, the production of some one else, and they state that they will insert it?

Mr. MANN. Well, that is very apt to be the case; yes.

Mr. FINLEY. What I had allusion to is this, that unless a matter is actually spoken in the Senate it is presumed not to go into the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. I believe that is the presumption, though it is a somewhat violent presumption; but the situation here is entirely different. The House has 435 Members. We bring in a rule here for the consideration of a bill. Under the rules of the House the Member who obtains the floor in general debate is entitled to an hour's time. We know that we can not give 435 hours to the consideration of a bill in the House, and the rule authorizes, and very often by unanimous consent the House authorizes, general leave to print.

Mr. FINLEY. Just there, Mr. Chairman; on page 91, section 69, paragraph 4, it is provided that either House may grant a Member leave to print or extend his remarks in the RECORD upon a stated subject, but the matter so printed shall be germane to such subject and shall not, unless otherwise authorized, exceed four pages of the RECORD in length—not upon the subject of debate, but the subject that he mentions.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but the general debate in the House is not confined in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to the bill pending before the House. You do not

seek to change that rule of the House, but a Member who obtains leave to extend his remarks must state the subject and must confine himself to the subject; and under this it is the duty of the Public Printer to read his remarks and see if he does confine himself to the subject, and if not, not print them. Of course the Public Printer will not do that and nobody expects him to do it.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. I am constrained to think that the gentleman from Illinois has not examined that as carefully as he might.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman from Indiana will not think that the gentleman from Illinois has not considered that carefully. I examine all these matters carefully, and I have examined this one carefully.

Mr. BARNHART. No doubt, from the statement that the gentleman makes, he feels that he is right, but he does not take into consideration lines 20 and 21 on page 91, and he does not take into consideration the provisions beginning on line 23 of page 91, because that language is as plain as words can make it that—"except such as shall be spoken in order" no matter "shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless specifically authorized by the respective House."

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; but the gentleman did not read the rest of it. Read the rest of it.

Mr. BARNHART. I read:

After having been referred to and reported upon by its Committee on Printing.

Mr. MANN. That was what I was talking about.

Mr. BARNHART. It is the matter that is not germane that he is referring to, not the spoken matter.

Mr. MANN. Of course words spoken in the House are not affected by this. The gentleman said I had not read the paragraph. It was the gentleman who had not recently read the paragraph. I said you could not put anything in here, practically, without having the Committee on Printing pass upon it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Under the provisions of that paragraph, could the letters that the President is going to write, commending these various gentlemen for their performance, be put in the RECORD?

Mr. MANN. Not unless they were read in the debate in the House or the Committee on Printing reported favorably on it and the House should pass an order permitting it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Then I am against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARNHART. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Illinois be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINLEY. I will supplement the answer of the gentleman from Illinois by saying it could not be done unless the House granted leave.

Mr. MANN. No; but the House can not grant leave for such a thing without referring it to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. GOULDEN. If the gentleman will yield, I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think that the four-page limit is a most commendable and wise provision to be placed in the bill? I have never heard the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] make a speech of sufficient length to cover more than four pages of the RECORD, and I think most of the men whose speeches are read and have any influence on the country at large never exceed that, because I think no one has the time to read a speech that covers 10 or 15 pages of the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. I made a speech on the pure-food bill that cost me \$1,000 to print, which was much longer than that, and much of it consisted of extracts which by permission were inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. GOULDEN. I hope the Lord will forgive the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Now, my understanding is that that could not be done under this bill.

Mr. FINLEY. Those extracts that the gentleman had printed were germane, were they not?

Mr. MANN. I think they were.

Mr. FINLEY. Does not the gentleman think that would come under this provision?

Mr. MANN. Not if they exceed four pages in length.

Mr. FINLEY. My view is that permission for the insertion of matter in the Record will go on much as it has gone on before.

Mr. MANN. I expect so. Why? Because the Public Printer will not undertake to carry out the law, and the result of it will be that Members of the House who are conscientious in their endeavor to obey the law will not print these speeches in the Record, and those who do not care whether they obey the law or not will print them in the Record. That happens now, sometimes.

Mr. FINLEY. That is an abuse which is practiced at times, is it not?

Mr. MANN. It is an abuse that you are going to encourage the practice of.

Mr. FINLEY. The purpose is to stop abuses to some extent.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me, I did not even say that I criticized the provision in the bill. I think it would be very unfortunate for the House to pass a proposition of this sort without anybody calling attention to what it means. Here is an entirely revolutionary proceeding in the House. A few moments ago, as I stated, there were 17 Members on the floor of the House. I do not propose to make the point of no quorum, because I do not wish to delay the consideration of the bill, and I do not propose to make a motion to strike this out, although I doubt whether it will ever become a law, and I am sure that if it does it will raise as much trouble as the docking resolution which we repealed this afternoon. It is impossible for all the Members of the House who wish to put their views in the Record to obtain the floor to make their speeches in the House itself, or to obtain permission under the provisions of this bill to insert speeches. Now, I have reached that stage in the proceedings of the House where I make too many speeches, where usually I get the floor without great difficulty, and where I seldom extend remarks. But I tell you that you can not enforce the provisions of this paragraph with the old Members of the House who have acted differently or with the new Members of the House who have no other opportunity to get into the Record. Refer it to the Committee on Printing! Well, I shall be sorry for the chairman of the Committee on Printing if this ever gets to be a law.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Illinois, I am very sorry that there are not more Members here to participate in the consideration of this important question; but, notwithstanding, I would like to call attention to a few features of the abuses under the present privilege of Record printing, that have grown to such proportions that, it seems to me, they ought to be corrected by some form of legislation. I understand that no enactment can be effective that may not inflict some hardship. And yet, Mr. Chairman, after years of deliberation, first by one committee and then another, we have reached the conclusion that there ought to be some method by which the privilege of padding the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to such an extent that it is a joke throughout the country ought to be curtailed. I want to call attention to a few specific instances, and I am not going to be partisan about this matter, and I am not going to mention names, because it is just as bad on this side of the House as it is on the other side, and I do not know but in one or two instances the big scandal that might have been precipitated if the newspapers of the country had known it would have fallen upon the Democratic side of the House. With due regard to his vast learning, the committee probably knows as much about this question as the gentleman from Illinois, and that is not any reflection on him. It is no extravagant self-praise of the committee to say it has been over these things studiously, and I want to call attention first to the provisions of the bill as we believe it should be, beginning with line 18, on page 91. I want to get this into the Record:

SEC. 69. PAR. 4. No matter that is not germane to the business before either House, except such as shall be spoken in order, shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless specifically authorized by the respective House after having been referred to and reported upon by its Committee on Printing.

That means that Dick, Tom, and Harry will not be permitted hereafter to jump up and offer all sorts of material for CONGRESSIONAL RECORD purposes, which has no place therein whatever.

Mr. MANN rose.

Mr. BARNHART. I hope I will not be interrupted until I have finished this, and then I will answer any question. This bill provides that—

either House may grant a Member leave to print or extend his remarks in the Record upon a stated subject—

just as we do now; we always require mention of the subject on which he is going to extend his remarks—

but the matter so printed shall be germane to such subject and shall not, unless otherwise authorized, exceed four pages of the Record in length: *Provided further*, That no address or speech not delivered in either House, and no book, pamphlet, newspaper or magazine article,

or document, except reports of committees, shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless read in order in either House or authorized by it after having been referred to and reported upon by its Committee on Printing.

Mr. Chairman, the committee believes that this will effectually safeguard the recklessness with which matters not germane to questions in hand nor to any subject of legitimate consideration by the House are thrown into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I want to give you a few instances. Under leave to extend remarks during the tariff debate not long ago a Member of the House inserted as a part of a general speech six bills not relating to the tariff introduced by himself, filling four pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and then added another page of his biography from the Congressional Directory.

Under leave to extend remarks during the currency debate a Member put in the Record a description of his European trip as printed in the Washington Post, discussing the cost of the trip, his seasickness, the cathedrals that he saw, and details of the complexity of foreign languages which he encountered.

Mr. BUTLER. Did he publish his photograph with it?

Mr. BARNHART. He probably would have if he could have got it in. The gentleman also published some correspondence with a Senator, and, under leave to extend his remarks, inserted it the next day after Congress adjourned, in which he bitterly assailed the Senator, contrary to all rules of either House.

Another gentleman, a Member of this House, under leave to print in the Record, put in a speech delivered by a former member of the President's Cabinet at a funeral of a celebrated brewer of the United States, thus adding advertising publicity to a certain brand of goods a like product of which made a certain city famous.

This same gentleman, under leave to extend remarks, inserted in the Record the index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the first and second sessions of the Sixty-second Congress relating to himself, here and there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARNHART. Another Member of this House, under leave to print, extended his remarks, inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the official proceedings of the third biennial meeting of the National Democratic League of Clubs, with an extended list of the contributors and expenditures, filling, in all, 20 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It costs \$31.05 a page, running cost of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to publish it. So that it cost over \$600 to insert these 20 pages of folderol about a Democratic league of clubs that originated and was kept afloat by a certain gentleman whose name I will not mention, largely for the purpose of providing himself with a job. What has become of the league I do not know, but I know it was an outrage for anyone to insert in the Record that stuff, not because it was any reflection upon the party, but because it had no business in the Record.

Another gentleman inserted in the Record, under leave to extend remarks, the constitution of the Women's National Democratic League. Another, under leave to extend remarks, inserted in the Record 30 pages of the official review of the Chicago convention contest, a memorable occasion, in which our friends the enemy broke up and had more or less of an extensive row. It had no place in the Record any more than the report of the Democratic League of Clubs.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARNHART. I will in a moment, after I have finished this. In another instance a Member of Congress, not at this end of the Capitol, inserted an article entitled "The Mission of Woman," and this article was afterwards expunged from the Record by order of the Senate and then reprinted in it after the serious objectionable parts had been taken out. The article was written 40 years ago, and said of the women of the North:

They would fain enter the lists of pothouse politicians and become the rivals of negroes. Let them, O fair daughters of the South, pursue their own course. But if they will unsex their souls, let them at the same time lay aside their modest apparel.

Another abuse not so very long ago was when there was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an allegorical cow that to my certain knowledge was 25 years old, because it had been published in a newspaper away back as far as the days of Cohn Harvey. And yet in the recent past a cartoon of that sort, without consent of the Joint Committee on Printing, was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If it had been first submitted, under the provisions of this bill, it never would have

been put in the RECORD, and thus caused the merited criticism of newspapers throughout the country.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. That was not chargeable to this body, was it?

Mr. BARNHART. No; it was not; and yet it got into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The general public does not discriminate as to who authorizes it; they only see the abuse.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The point I am trying to bring out is that all the abuse of this kind is not attributable to this body, where we are given leave to extend remarks.

Mr. BARNHART. Oh, no.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. Is it not a fact that these examples the gentleman has given, which I admit are outrageous, are rather the exception than the rule? The gentleman does not mean to have the country believe or infer that Members of Congress at either end of the Capitol are guilty of these extravagant practices of printing matter in the RECORD as a general thing?

Mr. BARNHART. Oh, no, Mr. Chairman; it is not common at all.

Mr. GOULDEN. It is not common, I am certain; but, inasmuch as this has occurred, I can not see any possible objection to forestalling such things in the future by this commendable section.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOULDEN. One thing I desire is to have the gentleman bring out the fact that the great majority of the Members are not guilty of practices of that character which the gentleman seeks to stop by the provision in this bill, because the newspapers are very apt to poke a good deal of fun at the Members of Congress, and when they do it justly I accept my share of the criticism; but I do not want to fall under the ban that the provision of this bill seeks, as I think very properly, to remedy.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I think, in reply to that, it is safe to say that the abuse of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is not general. On the other hand, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ordinarily costs about \$1,000,000 per Congress, and in these two years just about to pass it will cost pretty nearly twice that amount. The committee has kept not very careful, but general, oversight over what has been inserted, and a very great amount of this increased expense is due to the insertion of articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that have nothing whatever to do with the proceedings of Congress. For instance, just within the past few days there have been two requests granted for unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech of an ex-President of the United States—a lengthy speech. I hold in my hand here a special issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an abuse to which I called attention at the time that it was published. My recollection is that the cost of this one speech—not a speech, but the result of the unanimous consent to extend remarks in the RECORD—was \$13,860.

Mr. GOULDEN. That is, one issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that purpose, covering 363 pages, and costing over \$13,000. This certainly should be corrected.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. It was a special issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the express purpose of complying with the request, granted by unanimous consent, of a distinguished gentleman to extend his remarks in the RECORD. If the proposed law had been in effect that sort of voluminous publication would not have been permitted, even if the committee had reported it favorably.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The case to which the gentleman has just referred is another case where the responsibility was not upon the House, is it not?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. That was done under the rules and law governing another body; but this bill is drafted to regulate both branches of Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I understand that; but we have enough sins of our own to answer for without conveying the impression that we are responsible for somebody else, and I hope the gentleman will make that clear.

Mr. BARNHART. I tried to make that clear, and I think if the gentleman will read my remarks in the opening he will see that this is intended to cover the action of both branches of Congress, and he will see that I read down the list and told

what had occurred in this branch, and then I went on with what had occurred in the other branch of Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I probably did not hear the gentleman when he made that skip.

Mr. BARNHART. I hope I make myself clear now.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, I find that this special issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to which the gentleman from Indiana has just referred consists of 360 pages. It is all one gentleman's speech.

Mr. BARNHART. Oh, that is not a speech, but just matter that he had inserted into the RECORD under leave to extend his remarks.

Mr. GOULDEN. I have never read it, and I suppose nobody else ever did.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if the great majority of the abuses of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD do not come under the head of leave to print?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. There were 30,000 copies of this particular special issue printed and distributed, and a large majority of them would go through the mail.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. Assuming now that it costs from 6 to 7 cents a pound to go through the mail, there would be all that cost in addition to the Government Printing Office cost, which is between thirteen and fourteen thousand dollars.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; that is true. The cost of printing alone was \$13,860.

Mr. FINLEY. And the postal cost is in addition to that?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I would like now to be permitted to conclude this statement. I want to call attention to another matter, and that is this: In the not distant past there has come to the committee a request to publish a political campaign book—and I do not care whether it is the Democratic campaign book or the Republican campaign book or the Progressive campaign book or what not—I doubt the propriety, after we have given everybody leave to extend their remarks and discuss all of the political topics under the sun, of authorizing the publication of a campaign textbook in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is supposed to be and was originally intended to be a record of the actual proceedings of Congress. These instances that I have cited are few. Many, many more, though probably not so grave, could be found, and yet no doubt reference to the RECORD would show others that exceed these in gravity. The committee has undertaken to formulate a plan to prevent this. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] says that the work of the chairman of the committee will be most hazardous and laborious. The committee realizes this, and I believe the gentleman from Illinois will agree to it in a measure that when the membership of the House, that part of it which has been given to extravagant use of the RECORD in printing all sorts of magazine and newspaper articles and speeches, foreign to anything that could possibly pertain to Congress, understands that the particular matter they desire to be printed under extension of remarks must be offered in the House and then referred to the Committee on Printing and reported back to the House and submitted to the House for its approval, they will hesitate a long time before they will offer that sort of junk.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

Mr. BARNHART. I think I said that I would yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman did.

Mr. BARNHART. My time has expired, unfortunately.

Mr. MANN. That is all right. I simply wanted to ask the gentleman from Indiana whether he thought it was any more improper to publish the proceedings of the Republican National Convention in reference to a difficulty there than to publish the platforms of the two parties?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman asks me that question—

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I do not want this to be taken out of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARNHART. There is a wide difference between a declaration of national principles and a party row.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired, and the gentleman from Washington has the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Indiana, the chairman of the committee, will for

a moment give his attention, I desire to ask him some questions for information, and I take this occasion first to congratulate the gentleman—the chairman of the committee—on the work that that committee has been doing and what it has done already. I agree largely in reference to what has been done to stop the abuses of padding the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Now, I want to ask the gentleman whether this bill, if passed in the way in which it is reported here, will cure these abuses? Now, take the one case to which the gentleman alluded a moment ago, where, in the Senate, was inserted a whole volume costing, as the gentleman said, some \$13,000. Was not that inserted by permission specially given by the Senate? Could not that have occurred just the same under this bill if it became a law?

Mr. BARNHART. The two branches of Congress, as I understand, have a perfect right to conduct their affairs and control their own proceedings as they see fit, especially if it is done by unanimous consent.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I know; but I wish the gentleman—

Mr. BARNHART. I do not know but under the provision I read in reply to the gentleman from Illinois, when he said there was no way by which it could be done, where it says, "unless especially authorized," if it be specially authorized by either branch of Congress it can be done.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Now, take the document that is before the gentleman. It is my understanding that a distinguished Member of another body rose and said that he was going to read all of the stuff that went in there unless he was given permission to print it. Now, could not the same thing happen if this bill became a law? It would not stop that performance, would it?

Mr. BARNHART. No; it could not interfere with that except in so far as it would become a public document under the law.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Another matter I want to inquire about is this: I understand this limits a speech to four pages. I agree with most of the provisions, but I do not think that ought to be. Now, I will give an illustration. Suppose some Member of this House wants to discuss a question that is of particular importance in his locality. I will give the gentleman a personal illustration, because it has come to my mind, and many others have had the same experience. Say I wanted to discuss the question of Panama tolls. It is absolutely impossible for that question to be thoroughly discussed in four pages. Now, is it the purpose of the committee by this legislation not to permit a Member of Congress to print a speech of more than four pages—

Mr. BARNHART. Oh, no—

Mr. BUTLER. You can increase it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I want some information.

Mr. BARNHART. Congress would have a right to authorize it. The law says "unless specially authorized," and I have no doubt that if the gentleman should arise in the House on an important question of that kind and say to the House that the remarks and statistics that he had could not be contained in four pages of the RECORD, if he asked unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the question which he had prepared, there would not be any objection. Members of the House are generally fair.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Can that be done under the bill without referring it to a committee?

Mr. BARNHART. Not unless otherwise authorized. If you get consent of the House it could be done, but it would prevent the superfluities I have enumerated here and it would discourage Members from asking for the insertion of all sorts of speeches and publications for the reason that they would hesitate to refer questionable matter to a committee for approval.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Following the question asked by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], it seems to me that on a proper occasion and upon a proper subject—if the gentleman will answer the question in order that I may see if I am right—after a Member has had his hour in the House in which to make a speech he might have four pages in the RECORD in which to extend his remarks. If he desires more than four pages in which to print what he did not have an opportunity to say here in the House, the opportunity may be given him by the House. This bill will not deprive him of extending his remarks beyond four pages. It simply requires him to appeal to the House for the privilege.

Mr. BARNHART. Not in that instance, because he had the right to make the speech, and he might make it 10 pages long if he got the time, and then if he asked the unanimous consent

of the House to extend his remarks, rather than to take more time he could print his speech in full, no matter how many pages it would require.

Mr. BUTLER. I think this provision is a good one, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. With pleasure.

Mr. FINLEY. I have known of a few instances where a party did not obtain permission of the House to extend remarks—did not obtain recognition—and there was no general leave granted to extend remarks or insert remarks in the RECORD, and yet the speech appeared. I know of an instance several years ago where a lengthy speech occurred and the party did not even get recognition from the Chair. Now, it would be impossible under this provision of the law for that party to perform in that way.

Mr. AINEY. For the purpose of asking a brief question of the chairman of the committee—

Mr. BARNHART. Right there, will the gentleman yield? I want to add a word of explanation to what the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY] has said. As a matter of explanation to the gentleman's position, there are numerous instances wherein Members have risen and asked unanimous consent for leave to extend their remarks, and have then printed two or three speeches in the RECORD under one leave.

Mr. BUTLER. I appreciate that fact, and I have been thankful many, many times that they have asked permission to print rather than to inflict their speeches upon me as one Member who is required to sit here. [Applause and laughter.] But I think there should be some restraint placed upon the opportunity which gentlemen have had. And for one minute, if the chairman will give me his attention, I wish to state that this is a useful provision, because the time is not far off when the length of hours and the length of days will not be given to this House to properly attend to the business which it is required to attend to. I will ask the gentleman whether or not he has not omitted from this paragraph a word which it should contain. First, if I understand it, it has two propositions in it: First, that no matter that is not germane to the business before either House shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and, secondly, that unless it is spoken it shall not be printed. First, it shall be germane, and, secondly, it shall be spoken. If that be so, if I am right in my view of the paragraph and its true purposes, I think you should have the word "and" in between the words "House" and "except."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] has expired.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] may have five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARNHART. I will answer the question by saying it seems to me the insertion of the word "and" in there would couple the two together into one meaning.

Mr. BUTLER. Do you not intend to do it?

Mr. BARNHART. No.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it not the purpose of the act, first, to make the matter which is to go in the RECORD germane, and, secondly, that it shall be spoken? Because you provide for instances in which it need not be spoken and where matter can be printed when it is not germane.

Mr. BARNHART. In general debate the matter is frequently not germane, and yet it is spoken in order.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not propose to be technical about it, but that is the way it impressed me.

Mr. BARNHART. We want to get it right. That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. BUTLER. Any matter that is not germane to the business before either House shall not be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. No matter that is not spoken in order shall be printed. Does the gentleman catch the point I am endeavoring to make? It seems to me by reading it and by looking at the paragraph that the committee intended that first of all the matter spoken in the House should be germane to the business of the House.

Mr. BARNHART. I think if the gentleman will examine it carefully he will find that it would cut out general debate. It might be so construed by the insertion of the word "and" in there.

Mr. BUTLER. Of course I would not want that to occur.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] will yield, I do not think it is possible by law to control what is spoken in the House. If the House permits a man

to make a speech, it is within the control of the House and not in control of a law made by the President, the Senate, and the House combined. Now, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is supposed to show what is spoken in the House. That is the purpose of this exception. While it says "in order," that is not the business of this legislation. If it is spoken in the House, it is supposed to go in the RECORD, unless it is stricken out, as it was erroneously the other day.

Mr. BUTLER. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this paragraph is, first, to limit the matter spoken in debate to germaneness or that which pertains to the business of the House.

Mr. MANN. It is matter, though, which is not spoken in the House that this has reference to. This paragraph has reference to debate that does not take place. It is theoretical and not actual.

Mr. BUTLER. All right. It seems to be all right if we can pin it down.

Mr. AINEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the proviso in a formal way.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. AINEY] is recognized.

Mr. AINEY. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee whether the second and third provisos may not lead to some confusion? By the first proviso leave may be granted to a Member to print and extend his remarks in the RECORD upon a stated subject by action of the House. Supposing, now, that the Member should incorporate in that speech, or desire to incorporate in that speech, a newspaper article or a reference to some book or pamphlet, would not there be some confusion because of the terms of the second proviso, which prescribes that such may not be printed without the leave of the House after reference to the committee?

Mr. BARNHART. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the second proviso sets forth that—

No address or speech not delivered in either House, and no book, pamphlet, newspaper or magazine article, or document, except reports of committees, shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless read in order in either House or authorized by it after having been referred to and reported upon by its Committee on Printing.

Mr. AINEY. Yes; but, Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the other proviso also relates to an address not delivered in the House. Suppose a speaker proposed to incorporate in the RECORD a book or a newspaper article in order to illustrate his speech. He has leave to do so under the first proviso by securing leave of the House, but is prohibited from doing so under the second proviso other than as he may obtain from the Committee on Printing.

Mr. BARNHART. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the second proviso clearly refers to the matter as a whole, whereas if a man wanted to extend his remarks and wanted to use a quotation I do not see that there could be any limitation on that. But he would be prohibited from seeking to extend his remarks in the RECORD and then inserting this publication which is allowed under the first provision.

Mr. AINEY. Under this provision if anyone obtaining permission to extend remarks under the first proviso purposes to quote therein briefly from a newspaper article he can not so quote and print without obtaining a second leave under the second proviso, which requires submission to the Committee on Printing. Is that the purpose of the chairman?

Mr. BARNHART. If I have a short publication, yes; and if not, no. That is my answer. The purpose of this is to prevent a Member from doing what we frequently see done—rising and asking unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting a certain article, and then the next day another Member sees an article in refutation of it, and he asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting a certain other article. The purpose of this legislation is to see to it that these matters are referred to the committees of the respective Houses and let them pass upon them. I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Illinois if they do not believe that this precautionary feature of the law will prevent so much recklessness in the matter of filling the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with documents?

Mr. AINEY. I will say to the chairman of the committee that I find myself quite in accord with the purposes of this bill, but I doubt if confusion will not arise by these two provisions, one of them providing for permission to be granted by the House upon request, and the other necessitating the going to the committee with the further request if it is intended to cover a quotation from some book or newspaper which the speaker desires to incorporate in his extended remarks.

Mr. BARNHART. Just one moment. It was the intention of the committee—and I still believe that it is clear—that the second provision is simply a limitation on the first—to prevent

abuse if a Member undertakes to offer an article in order, or, as we see it frequently done and as the gentleman from Pennsylvania sees it done, where a Member will write two three lines and then insert four or five pages of a book or a document.

I will say in this connection that not in this branch of Congress, but in another one, and not very long ago, a publication was given in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD relative to child labor that covered pages and pages and pages, and it was printed as a public document afterwards; and it cost the Government, according to the figures I heard last, something like \$45,000. I do not suppose the man who put it in there ever read all of it, and I do not know that he will ever read all of it, and I do not know that an estimate of the printing cost was ever asked for. In that case it could be referred to the Committee on Printing, and they would take it up with the Member; and if they decided to report it favorably they could report it to the House, and the House could do with it what it saw fit. It leaves the matter in the hands of the House and not in the hands of the individual Member. That would prevent the possibility in the future of such abuses as have occurred heretofore. They could not occur under the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inquire of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. AINEY] if his pro forma amendment is withdrawn?

Mr. AINEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I ask leave to withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. MANN. Then I renew the pro forma amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois renews the pro forma amendment.

Mr. MANN. I am quite in sympathy, Mr. Chairman, with the gentleman from Indiana and the Committee on Printing in the endeavor to prevent many of the abuses that come from printing in the RECORD. I do not believe there is any Member of the House who stays on the floor of the House more than I do or who keeps closer track of the proceedings in the House than I do. I have seen gentleman after gentleman during my term of service rise and say that he was going to stop all future leaves to extend remarks. I think I heard the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] come pretty nearly making that statement.

Mr. BARNHART. That I would try to.

Mr. MANN. I know that I heard the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] make that statement. I remember distinctly hearing the distinguished leader of the Progressive Party [Mr. MURDOCK], who has not been here for a long time, make that statement here in the House. I have seen them come and go, but I never saw one yet to stick out with his resolution; and yet I am not criticizing them for yielding. Why? Everyone knows that if you insist upon nothing being printed in the RECORD except what was spoken in debate, 12 months in the year would not be long enough for windjamming in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BUTLER. One hundred months in the year would not be long enough.

Mr. MANN. I sometimes wish myself that there were more extensions and leaves to print and fewer actual speeches; and yet it would not be gracious for me to say that, because I make too many speeches.

Now, I agree with the gentleman from Indiana that something ought to be done, but I think that something ought to be done that is practical. Who is to determine about these things? Suppose the House grants leave to me to-day to extend my remarks, and this bill is in effect. Who is to determine whether what I insert is germane or not? Who is to determine whether I have put an editorial from some paper in my remarks or not? Who is going to prevent the speech being printed? My distinguished friend from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY] both stated a while ago that they knew of cases where men had inserted speeches in the RECORD without any permission at all. How did it happen? How did the gentlemen know it? Why did they not stop it? Why did they not strike it out of the RECORD as a matter of precaution in the future?

Mr. FINLEY. I will answer for myself. I knew nothing about it until it was all in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. Then it was not too late to strike it out. I am not criticizing the gentleman for not moving to strike it out. But the same thing will happen again. Who is going to determine? Shall it be the Public Printer? Why, we had an officer of the House here the other day obeying an order of the House; yet he was seriously criticized by several gentlemen on the floor

who thought that the dignity of their position had been invaded. If some gentleman gets leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and the Public Printer tells him to go to, and throws his remarks in the wastebasket, there will be an explosion here like a bomb falling from an aeroplane. Who is to determine? I believe if you do something, you ought to do it so that it will work.

Now, I have heard several gentlemen tell about these leaves that have been granted in the past under which matters have been inserted which ought not to have been inserted in the RECORD. I am looking now at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of a few days ago, and I find an article in it, practically the same thing having been published before by Members of Congress, inserted here by a member of the Committee on Printing. I am not criticizing him for inserting it, although much of the same stuff—I will not say “stuff,” much of the same fine matter—has been inserted before, originally. I believe, by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] on labor propositions, and other Members have taken a pair of shears and a bottle of paste and written new speeches and inserted them in the RECORD. I am not criticizing that. What do they do it for? To send it to their constituents, so they can tell what great work has been done or has not been done by the Democratic Congress.

Mr. FINLEY. The gentleman asks. Who will prevent the abuses in the future? Does not the gentleman think a positive provision of law prohibiting abuses of that character would act as a deterrent?

Mr. MANN. Why, there is a positive provision of law now that forbids a man to insert in the RECORD remarks which he has not permission to insert, and yet gentlemen cite as a reason for this the fact that Members have violated the law in the other respect. Now, a law ought to be so framed that honest men can properly obey it and dishonest men can not easily evade it.

Mr. FINLEY. The purpose here is to make the law more explicit, so that every Member of Congress may know what it is and understand it and obey it. I will say, further, that I think that the disciplining of about one Member under this proposed provision of law would be enough to settle the question for a good while after that.

Mr. MANN. Oh, pshaw! Talk about Members being disciplined! I know several Members of this House who are sending out political letters under their franks in violation of law, as I read the law. You can not discipline them for it. Each man looks at these matters according to his own lights, and if he stays here, according to the lights of his constituents; but you can not provide by a law so that you can have a practice in the House of Representatives unless you have a reasonable law.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I appreciate the fact that it is utterly impossible to enact any legislation anywhere that will be strictly observed by all men; but in the House of Representatives, when we discover abuses that exist whereby there are enormous losses to the Treasury of the United States, it seems to me it is high time for the Congress to get busy on its own account and try, to the largest extent possible, to set its own house in order. Now if we know of these things existing, and we wink at them, of course the criticism of the public is going to increase. In this connection I am going to impose upon the RECORD long enough to read an extract from an editorial in the New York Press of August 26. It says:

A well-edited report of real debate, confined to things actually said, would attract a great deal of interest. Few people read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because of the interminable length of speeches issued on “leave to print.” If Congress won’t listen to these speeches, with all the added interest that comes from the personality of a statesman engaged in public debate, the public are not going to stop to read them.

Thus the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to those who receive it, is a daily reminder of unbusinesslike methods. The Congress that shall have the force to cut out such absurdities will make more friends than it is now able to realize.

Mr. Chairman, that is in conformity with my experience and observation both as a newspaper man and a Member of the House for several years. I think I stated once before on the floor of the House that Members of Congress who send copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to newspaper offices are really considered a joke. Back in the days when we kindled fires in stoves in the early fall—and a good many of them do yet—the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as it came to the newspaper office was corded up by the devil in the office to be used as fuel. We used it to prop up the windows and to cut into wrappers, but I am safe in saying that not one CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in ten that goes into the average newspaper office of the United States is ever opened to be read, because the daily news service furnishes to these newspaper men a touch of what is being

done in Congress from day to day, and they edit from their wire service or other press reports that come as the summarized proceedings of Congress, and that is all they have time to consider. I merely call attention to this to show that the growing tendency to pad the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with all sorts of extraneous matter is making the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD more and more a bore in the estimation of the reading public of the United States.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE. How would the gentleman answer the question of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] as to the person who shall determine whether the matter submitted is germane or not?

Mr. BARNHART. The bill provides a printing clerk, who shall have charge of the editing of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The law regulates the Public Printer. I call the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the fact that we have a Public Printer who has some one at the Government Printing Office who exercises very vigilant scrutiny over what comes down there for printing.

Mr. MOORE. For one I am very glad of that.

Mr. BARNHART. For instance, within the last few days some copy for a book was sent down there by a House committee. The bulk of it was a so-called public document which was not a public document at all, but a personal testimonial, and it was refused by the Public Printer, who referred it back to the Committee on Printing and said that he would not print it under the law authorizing the printing and binding for committees unless it was O. K’d by the Committee on Printing. The Committee on Printing refused to O. K. it and the document will not be printed, because it is not a public document. It would cost something like \$500 to print and bind it for the benefit of a very few. If they want to have it printed and pay for it, that is their privilege, and I hope they will have it done; but the people ought not to be expected to pay for these things, and the renewed regulations and the more stringent rules adopted from time to time by the Joint Committee on Printing and the Printing Committees of the two Houses are eliminating more and more of unwarranted printing; and if you give the committee an authorization of law to take a step further and exercise some control over the superfluous matter that is inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD we believe it will have a like helpful effect.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. With what the gentleman from Indiana has said in the matter of striking out superfluous material and matter that is not germane, I heartily agree. I think the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would be heightened in interest and value if it were severely cut. There is too much in it for an ordinary Member of Congress to read, let alone the ordinary citizen. I question whether authority is given to anyone in section 68 or the preceding sections to exercise any control over the matter submitted by Members of Congress which might not be germane. The Committee on Printing is itself given authority in section 68 to oversee addresses “not delivered in the House, books, pamphlets, magazines, articles,” and so forth, and I suppose they would go to the Committee on Printing and the committee would exercise some authority. As to leave-to-print speeches, apparently that would not be submitted to the Committee on Printing, and it is not the duty of anyone to supervise them, except this “competent person” mentioned in section 69, paragraph 3.

Now, it is patent to all who read the RECORD, and I am one who tries to follow it, that matter not germane very frequently creeps in under leave to print. That is an abuse. Another abuse is the insertion in the daily proceedings of the House of matter under leave to print that has no bearing on the proceedings of the House. That would give rise to the criticism of the paper which the gentleman from Indiana quoted a little while ago. But reverting to the interrogatory of the gentleman from Illinois, just how are you going to check that up? I would like to see it done. I would support the gentleman from Indiana and his committee in any movement to edit the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, boil it down, or summarize it. But is anyone given authority to do that here? Would it be possible to create an editorship and have the copy visced, as in a newspaper office; have it blue penciled? I do not know that we want to give anyone authority to blue pencil our copy, but I think some one should have authority, like the Committee on Printing, to see that this extraneous matter that does not appear to be germane shall not be inserted in an improper place, and that personal and political matter shall not appear as a part of the proceedings of Congress. Such matters ought to be scrutinized.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman understands that the Government Printing Office has a corps of copy readers?

Mr. MOORE. Yes; but with no editorial authority.

Mr. BARNHART. No; but when a speech came in under leave to print they would be expected to look it over, and they would look it over, as the other matter was looked over to which I referred; if questionable, referred to the Committee on Printing, and then it would be for the Committee on Printing to decide whether or not it ought to go in. I want to say in this connection that if the Committee on Printing had had charge of the Record in the not very distant past some things would not be in the Record that have appeared, because it was a great abuse.

Mr. MOORE. I recall, and I have no doubt the gentleman recalls, an instance in which not very long ago a speech was inserted under leave to print, which nobody in the House had an opportunity to see or scrutinize, reflecting very severely on certain citizens who had no opportunity to respond. These citizens had no chance to be heard as to the accusations therein made. We might call it a scurrilous speech. The speech went into the private affairs of private citizens, dragged them into the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where none of us wanted to see them and where the only purpose attained was scandal. Some one ought to have observed that and called it to the attention of the Committee on Printing. Some one ought to have authority to know that it could not go in until it was O. K'd.

Mr. BARNHART. Nobody under the existing law has any authority to do anything of that kind now.

Mr. MOORE. Who has the authority under this bill to do that?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask to proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARNHART. I will say in reply to the gentleman that it is the bounden duty of the Public Printer to observe the law regulating public printing and binding, and when this law takes effect he will be bound, through his assistants, to see when leave-to-print speeches come to him whether they are in order. If there is a question in his mind, he will do what he does now in the instance I have cited, refer them to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. MOORE. I think the gentleman and his committee are doing a splendid work in codifying the printing laws, and I would like to support him. But let us see if this is the proviso on which the gentleman relies, page 92, line 3:

Provided, further, That no address or speech not delivered in either House, and no book, pamphlet, newspaper or magazine article, or document, except reports of committees, shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless read in order in either House or authorized by it after having been referred to and reported upon by its Committee on Printing.

Is that the proviso on which the gentleman places his faith?

Mr. BARNHART. That is the proviso, if there is a request to insert a book as a whole, without any reference to remarks.

Mr. MOORE. Wherein is the check to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. BARNHART. Under the general provision governing the Public Printer or superintendent of documents, wherein, if the Public Printer, the superintendent of documents, or any other officer or employee of the Government Printing Office shall permit or knowingly be party to any evasion or violation of this act, whereby the Government shall suffer any loss or damage therefrom, he shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

Mr. MOORE. Where is that?

Mr. BARNHART. Beginning on page 76. We have long since passed it. It fixes a fine of \$5,000, and with that penalty over the Printer he will be careful to see that the law regulating the extension of remarks is carefully enforced so far as he is concerned. If there arise a question in his mind as to the admissibility of matter, he will refuse it and refer it to the Committee on Printing of the respective House by which the leave was granted.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is satisfied in his own mind that he has put a proper check in the Government Printing Office where the copy must go?

Mr. BARNHART. It is about as strong, it seems to the committee, as it could possibly be made. We exact from the Public Printer a stricter observation of the law governing him than ever before, because we propose to fine him \$5,000 if he does not observe the law. That is one thing we did not have

before. We expect under the provisions of this bill that the Public Printer will more carefully scrutinize what is to be done in his office at the suggestion of Members of Congress than ever before.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee one or two questions. It is the purpose of this paragraph to prohibit in the future the insertion in the Record of matter that is not germane, unless it is spoken here on the floor. Will not all material have to go somewhere before it is published in the Record? Will not this paragraph require the submission of all material to some one in authority?

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly.

Mr. BUTLER. And the one in authority will determine whether or not it is germane?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I think that is about as strong as the gentleman can make it by indirection. He might, perhaps, provide for an editor and provide that nothing shall be published until the editor has approved it; but the proposed law is that nothing shall be published in the Record that is not germane unless it is spoken here. If it is not germane, it has to go back to the Committee on Printing for privilege. Will the question of germaneness be entirely within the province of the Member printing? I think not. It seems to me that there is some one provided for here. It is certainly the intention of the bill that this material shall all be submitted to some one.

Mr. BARNHART. It shall be submitted to the Public Printer.

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly; and if he has any doubt about it—

Mr. BARNHART. The Public Printer is under penalty to see that the law is enforced.

Mr. BUTLER. If he has any doubt about it, it goes back to the Committee on Printing, and that will determine it.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. BUTLER. I think that is perhaps as strong as we can make it, unless we provide for an editor.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. The provision on page 92 provides that no speech not delivered in either House shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, unless read in order in either House. If it is not delivered in the House, how is it going to be read in order in the House? I do not understand that. The idea of getting leave to print is that it shall not be read in order, but shall be inserted under the leave to print.

Mr. BARNHART. This does not refer to a speech of a Member at all, and yet if a Member should secure time to deliver an address, and he saw fit to read the remarks of some one else, he could read any sort of a speech into the Record that the House would permit.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I refer to a very common practice in the House. I get leave to extend my remarks upon some given subject. I do not actually deliver that speech in the House. I extend my remarks, but as I understand this proviso, a speech which under those circumstances would not be delivered, can not be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless it has been read in order in the House.

Mr. BARNHART. If the gentleman will refer to line 8, on page 92, he will find this language:

Or authorized by it after having been referred to and reported upon by its Committee on Printing.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I want to ask about that alternative also. Of course if it is not delivered in the House, it can not be read in the House. Must I take that speech before it is printed down to the Committee on Printing and get its O. K. before it can be printed in the Record?

Mr. BARNHART. Is the gentleman asking me?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. If the gentleman will refer to the beginning of the paragraph, in line 23, on page 91, he will find this proviso:

Provided, That either House may grant a Member leave to print or extend his remarks in the RECORD upon a stated subject, but the matter so printed shall be germane to such subject and shall not, unless otherwise authorized, exceed four pages of the RECORD in length.

The next provision follows and places a limitation upon that by providing:

Provided further, That no address or speech not delivered in either House, and no book, pamphlet, newspaper or magazine article, or document, except reports of committees, shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless read in order in either House or authorized by it after having been referred to and reported upon by its Committee on Printing.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Is this to be the form of procedure? If I get leave to print and then do not read that speech in order in the House—

Mr. BARNHART. Not a speech. This does not refer to a speech. It has reference to a printed address, book, or something of that kind.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do not know about that. It says no speech not delivered in either House.

Mr. BARNHART. That means an address delivered outside by some one else who is not a Member of the House.

Mr. SAUNDERS. If this is what is referred to, it calls for some amendment, because as it is written, it is broad enough to include every situation that I have presented in the questions that I have asked the Chairman.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. If the language here refers only to Members of the House, it would not be in the bill at all, would it?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I do not understand.

Mr. FESS. The bill says no address or speech not delivered in either House. If the address is delivered by some one who is not a Member of the House, it could not have been delivered in the House, and it must refer to some one else, not a Member of the House.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Why? If I get leave to print, I do not deliver the speech in the House.

Mr. BUTLER. That might be by a Member himself outside of the House.

Mr. SAUNDERS. That may be, but it can also refer to a Member who gets leave to print a speech in the Record.

Mr. FESS. Suppose the gentleman were to deliver a speech at Richmond, which is not delivered here?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I understand perfectly well that this language controls that situation, but it also specifically applies to a case in which a Member secures leave to print. When a Member obtains leave to print he does not deliver that speech in the House, nor does he read it in order in the House. He puts it in the Record. This language is broad enough to cover precisely that situation, and I ask the chairman of the committee if he intends by this language that after a Member secures leave to print from the House he must go before the Committee on Printing and secure their O. K. before his speech can be printed in the Record?

Mr. FESS. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is the situation that I am presenting, and it is one of interest to all the Members. If the language used is intended to refer to speeches other than those of a Member under the leave to print, then this language should be in some wise amended. In its present form it is too broad and limits the rights of the Members to an extent possibly not contemplated by the committee.

Mr. BARNHART. Would not the objection be cured by inserting a comma after the word "speech," in line 4. I think that would put it more clearly.

Mr. MOORE. Would the gentleman object to having stricken out, line 7, after "unless read in order in either House or authorized by it after having been referred to and reported upon by its Committee on Printing," and insert "shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD unless permission shall have first been obtained in either House"?

Mr. SAUNDERS. That would be satisfactory. The amendment can be made in that connection or in the connection above. I think the gentleman's suggestion would entirely meet the situation.

Mr. MOORE. It is surely confusing as it is printed.

Mr. BARNHART. I am not sure but by that change it would put us back exactly where we now are.

Mr. SAUNDERS. No—

Mr. BARNHART. That is exactly what you have now.

Mr. MOORE. If this is clear, the only new thing you have is to obtain permission of the Committee on Printing, which is the new feature.

Mr. BARNHART. The new feature in this provision, as the committee tried to fix it, is this: When reprint matter is offered, when a Member rises and asks for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of an editorial or even a speech delivered by some man in the gentleman's State of Texas, for instance, it is intended to limit that, and I referred to several instances in my remarks a while ago where speeches have been inserted in the Record which by no stretch of the imagination or consistency can have any place therein. Now, when a Member rises and asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks, and states what it is, under the provision here it would then have to be referred to the Committee on Printing, and if they decide that it would be all right they report favorably.

Mr. SLAYDEN. What the gentleman desires to do is to impede the insertion of matter not actually a part of the debate on the floor of the House?

Mr. BARNHART. That is certainly our intention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SLAYDEN. And it is a very good intention, too.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Mr. Chairman, I will say to my friend from Texas that I am in hearty accord with the idea of correcting abuses, but I must say that this language, unless in some wise it is limited, is broad enough to bring about a resulting annoyance to the Members without accomplishing any useful result. Suppose that this bill should be enacted into law and a Member should secure leave to print. He will not deliver that speech in the House, nor will he read it in order in the House. Hence under the present language, before the Member can avail himself of his leave to print and publish his speech in the Record, he must go before the Committee on Printing and have them make a report. After the leave to print has been obtained a Member should not be required to secure further leave from the Committee on Printing. Hence I say that is a matter of interest to every Member of the House.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I will say in reply to the gentleman that I rather think that that course would have to be resorted to.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Does the gentleman think we ought to do that? Does he think that every time a Member of this House secures leave to extend his remarks he must submit those remarks to the Committee on Printing and obtain a favorable report from that committee before his speech can be printed in the Record?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I will say to the gentleman it will have a tendency to stop this flood of useless nonpolitical matter; and if so, I think it would be a pretty good thing.

Mr. SAUNDERS. This language would not stop that at all. It would merely put the Members to an additional and vexatious trouble.

Mr. SLAYDEN. That will stop it.

Mr. SAUNDERS. No; because when I obtain leave to print I apprehend that the Committee on Printing would hesitate to put a veto upon a permit derived from the House. The Member would be reasonably certain to secure a favorable report. But having secured from the House the necessary authority to print his remarks, he ought not to be required to apply to a committee of the House for a ratification of that power.

Mr. SLAYDEN. There must be some approval to pass on the subject of germaneness.

Mr. SAUNDERS. In this connection?

Mr. MOORE. In reference to the question of germaneness, that seems to me to be covered by the preceding proviso. If the gentleman will read that, he will find that it must be germane. The only question is as to the authority to determine—

Mr. SAUNDERS. He first secures the authority. I wish to have the attention of the committee fixed on the meaning of the language used. He first, I say, secures the authority to extend his remarks. Thereafter, in conformity to that authority, he writes his speech for publication. Under the language under consideration he must then take this speech before the Committee on Printing and secure a report authorizing its publication before it can be printed in the Record. This, I say, a Member should not be required to do.

Mr. MOORE. Get the consent of the committee? I do not so understand. I understand the committee says it is not, but all of the gentlemen who have been following this know it makes possible that procedure.

Mr. BARNHART. Such is not the intention of the committee at all if a Member had authority to extend his remarks. Now, on page 92, line 4, after the word "speech," strike out "not delivered in either House" and insert "by other than the person requesting leave to insert the same."

Mr. SAUNDERS. That is all right.

Mr. BARNHART. That would protect it. I send the amendment to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

Mr. SAUNDERS. That will make it doubly clear.

Mr. MOORE. That is just as to outside matter not originating with the Member?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 92, line 4, after the word "speech" in line 4, strike out the words "not delivered in either House" and insert "by other than the person requesting leave to insert the same."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I see the difficulty that gentlemen desire to obviate, but one of the greatest abuses in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if it is abuse at all—and I do not express an opinion about that—is if a Member of the House goes away from here and makes a political speech or some other kind of a speech he comes back and asks leave to insert it in the RECORD. This amendment permits that.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Suppose that is made to read in this way, namely, by striking out the words "not delivered." What was the proposed amendment? Does it say "delivered by some person other than a Member of the House"?

Mr. FESS. Other than the person making the request.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I like the idea of declining to print speeches not made on the floor of the House. My idea is that the RECORD ought to be made a record of the proceedings here and nothing more.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman wants to carry it out, all he has to do is to sit in the House and object. If a Member asks unanimous consent to extend remarks in the RECORD, that could be objected to.

Mr. SLAYDEN. This is trying to obviate the disagreeable necessity of doing that. Does not the gentleman from Illinois think that the RECORD would be vastly improved and a much more edifying and interesting publication if it were so confined, and would be more thoroughly read, by Members at least?

Mr. MANN. To be candid, there are times when I read speeches delivered in the House when I think the speech which is delivered is better than extraneous matter, and then there are many times when I think the extraneous matter in speeches which Members insert very much improves the speeches.

Mr. SLAYDEN. That is undoubtedly true. Those things are available to any Member. He can get them without putting the expense of printing them on the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 92, line 7, after the word "unless," strike out all of lines 7, 8, and 9 and insert the words "permission shall have first been obtained in either House."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, as I stated before, that surely would result in the present practice. It would leave the door as wide open as it is now to all sorts of matter going into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It seems to me the gentleman from Pennsylvania would not consider that as any restriction on existing privileges whatever. And if that is adopted it would shear the entire provision of any possibility to regulate the matter as to preventing occasional abuse, namely, the privilege of extending remarks by throwing the bars down.

Mr. MOORE. While the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] was on his feet I asked the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] the question whether it was the purpose to have these particular matters referred to the Committee on Printing, and he said it was not. And it was because of that statement I offered this amendment. It appeared to me, as it seemed to appear to the gentleman from Virginia, that it would be a matter of much circumlocution to come into the House for the privilege of extending one's remarks and inserting a speech that was worthy of printing and then have to go to the Committee on Printing to obtain its assent. There should be some responsibility on the Committee on Printing to require information at the time the request is made as to whether the matter was germane or not or whether it was proper to print.

Mr. BARNHART. With the gentleman's permission, if the committee has not been able to classify the difference between these two provisions it is because of lack of ability to do so, because the purpose of it was to make them perfectly distinct and clear, inasmuch as the second was to be a limitation on the first. If it is the opinion of the committee that it does place any censorship over the extension of actual remarks of a Member, it should not do so except if some Member would get permission to extend his remarks and then indulge in a diatribe like the gentleman from Pennsylvania referred to, and it would

be up to the Public Printer to refer it to the committee as to whether or not such matter would be germane.

Mr. MOORE. Now, let me put a case in point. I would like the attention of the chairman of the committee in order to see if we understand each other. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] makes a speech down at Richmond on good roads, and it is deemed worthy by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to be put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania rises to ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the address made by his colleague, Judge SAUNDERS, of Virginia, at Richmond, on the subject referred to, and the consent of the House is granted. Under this paragraph, as we have it, it would appear that that address of Judge SAUNDERS would have to be read in either House, or authorized by it, after having been referred to and reported upon by its Committee on Printing. That is to say, if I had sought to have the address of the gentleman from Virginia printed, it being a matter which seemed to be proper and worthy to be printed, I would first have to go to the Committee on Printing and obtain its assent before I asked permission of the House.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. I will say no.

Mr. MOORE. Then this language certainly is not clearly understood by some of us.

Mr. BARNHART. It would be offered to the House and referred to the Committee on Printing, and O. K'd by the Committee on Printing, and passed as a privileged resolution, as other matters are passed on report from the Committee on Printing; and I am sure no Committee on Printing would undertake to eliminate from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech of the kind referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]. On the other hand, it would have authority to eliminate such a speech as the gentleman referred to as having assailed the character of a private individual who had no means of equally public reply.

Mr. MOORE. I would stop that. Then after the unanimous consent was given, could it be printed?

Mr. BARNHART. It would go to the committee and be acted upon and a reprint ordered.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman's understanding is that after I had obtained the consent of the House to print the speech of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] then I would have to go to the Committee on Printing and obtain its consent. This seems an unnecessary hardship on the Member.

Mr. BARNHART. I will say to the gentleman that when the gentleman got unanimous consent to insert the speech in the RECORD the Speaker would refer it to the Committee on Printing, just as other requests are referred here in the matter of the printing of documents. It would go to the Committee on Printing and be reported back to the House favorably or unfavorably.

Mr. MOORE. That would necessitate delay, and it might not all be done in the same day.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 92, line 9, after the word "Printing," insert the words "and it shall be the duty of the Public Printer to enforce the provisions of this paragraph."

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman think that would be a good thing to do—to make it the duty of the Public Printer to enforce the provisions of the paragraph?

Mr. BARNHART. The committee will accept it. It simply emphasizes what has already been said and makes it perfectly clear.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14233) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 12665. An act to increase the limit of cost of the public building at La Junta, Colo.

REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF PRINTING LAWS.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.
The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 60, PAR. 6. The Public Printer shall furnish the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows and shall supply gratuitously no others in addition thereto:

To the Vice President and each Senator, 88 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner, 60 copies, to be supplied daily as originally published or in bound form as each may order, but not to exceed five sets each shall be bound, unless specifically requested by the Vice President, Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner entitled to the same; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner there shall be furnished 3 additional copies of the daily RECORD, 1 to be delivered at his residence, 1 at the Capitol, and 1 to be reserved by the Public Printer in unstitched form to be promptly bound in paper when each semimonthly index shall be issued; to each standing committee of Congress, 1 daily copy; to the Secretary and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, and to the Clerk and the Doorkeeper of the House, 10 copies each, in daily or bound form, and not to exceed 20 daily copies each, for office use; to the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, 10 copies in daily or bound form and not to exceed 20 daily copies, for the use of the Senate; and to the Doorkeeper of the House, 10 copies in daily or bound form, and not to exceed 30 daily copies for the use of the House of Representatives; to the President, 4 copies of the daily RECORD and 1 bound copy; to the Chief Justice, each of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, the marshal and the clerk of said court, each 1 copy of the daily RECORD and 1 bound copy; to the governor of each State and Territory, 1 copy of the daily RECORD and 1 bound copy; to the official reporters of the Senate and the House, each 2 copies of the daily RECORD and 1 bound copy; to the libraries of the Senate and the House, 1 copy of the daily RECORD and not to exceed 20 bound copies each; to the superintendents of the Senate and House document rooms, each 3 copies of the daily RECORD and 1 bound copy; to the Library of Congress, not to exceed 110 copies of the daily RECORD for its own use and for distribution, through the Smithsonian Institution, to the legislative chambers of such foreign Governments as may agree to send to the United States current copies of their parliamentary record or like publications, such publications, when received, to be deposited in the Library of Congress, and not to exceed 110 copies of the bound RECORD for its own use and for international exchange; to the Librarian of Congress, 1 copy each of the daily and the bound RECORD, which he is authorized to furnish to the undersecretary of state for external affairs of Canada in exchange for a copy of the Parliamentary Hansard, which shall be deposited in the Department of State; to the Smithsonian Institution, United States National Museum, the Civil Service Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Naval Observatory, each 1 daily and 1 bound copy of the RECORD; to the Soldiers' Home in Washington, D. C., to the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and each branch thereof, and to each State or Territorial home for either Federal or Confederate soldiers and sailors or for their widows and orphans, 1 copy of the daily RECORD; to the superintendent of documents, a sufficient number of copies of the daily and bound RECORD to enable him to make distribution to depository libraries; to each of the legations of the United States abroad, 1 copy of the daily RECORD, to be sent through the Secretary of State; to each foreign legation in Washington whose Government extends a like courtesy to our legations abroad, 1 copy of the daily RECORD, to be sent through the Secretary of State and furnished upon his requisition; to each newspaper correspondent whose name appears in the Congressional Directory and who makes application therefor, 1 copy of the daily RECORD and one copy of the bound RECORD, the same to be sent to his office address, or elsewhere in the city of Washington, as he may direct; to the press galleries of the Senate and the House, respectively, 2 copies each of the daily RECORD and 1 copy each of the bound RECORD; to the Governor General of the Philippine Islands, at Manila, and to the Governor of Porto Rico, at San Juan, each 10 copies of the daily RECORD.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to insert, on page 93, line 4, after the word "residence," the words "or his office."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 93, line 4, after the word "residence," insert the words "or his office."

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman any objection to letting these daily copies be delivered at the office of a Member?

Mr. BARNHART. None whatever.

Mr. MANN. I supposed not.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I notice that you provide that the Parliamentary Hansard that we get from Canada shall be deposited in the Department of State. Why should it not go to the Congressional Library? We recently passed a resolution to permit an exchange. I do not know what they want it for in the State Department. I think it ought to be in the Congressional Library.

Mr. BARNHART. The Library of Congress gets a set under existing law, and it is satisfactory to the Secretary of State. This is a provision that is comparatively new. It was passed in 1912, and the Secretary of State gets a copy and the Congressional Library a copy, and both are supplied.

Mr. MANN. Very well. When the law was passed the statement was made that we did not have an exchange with the Canadian Government at all, and this was to permit an ex-

change. Of course, if they get a set in the Congressional Library, that is all they want, but I am quite confident—and I would put my judgment up against that of the clerk of the committee—that when we passed that resolution two years ago we authorized this exchange. May I ask another question?

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Where do the departments get their sets of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from? Where is the authorization of a set of the daily RECORD to go to each of the departments?

Mr. BARNHART. They requisition for the amount they want; it is charged to their printing allotment, and the bound set is furnished to each depository library.

Mr. MANN. The departments now, you say, when they want a set of the daily RECORD, have it charged to their printing allowance?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. They requisition for it if they want it.

Mr. MANN. Why is it not charged to the Interstate Commerce Commission on their printing allowance, and to the United States National Museum and the Civil Service Commission on their printing allowances, and to the Naval Observatory? You provide here for the Smithsonian Institution, the National Museum, the Civil Service Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Naval Observatory. They all have printing allowances. Of course, do not understand that I am making any criticism. I am just asking for information. If they are to continue to get these, I have nothing further to say. I do not care how they get them. I asked the question because I did not find any place in here where it was provided that the RECORD should be delivered to the different departments. Of course they have to have the RECORD.

Mr. BARNHART. These departments to which the gentleman refers have not depository libraries, but the other departments do have depository libraries.

Mr. MANN. They do not, any of them, have depository libraries.

Mr. BARNHART. Oh, yes; each executive department has.

Mr. MANN. What do you mean by "depository libraries"?

Mr. BARNHART. They are given one copy of each Government publication for their libraries.

Mr. MANN. That does not include the daily RECORD. The daily RECORD is not sent to the depositories.

Mr. BARNHART. It includes the bound RECORD.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes. I am not talking about the bound RECORD. I do not care whether they get the bound RECORD or not. It may be suitable to stack up in piles. I am sure that they do not all take it.

Mr. BARNHART. The bill provides that they shall have a copy of the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. Where is it? I do not say it is not there, but it is not in this section. I could not find it.

Mr. BARNHART. At the top of page 95, it is provided—

To the superintendent of documents, a sufficient number of copies of the daily and bound RECORD to enable him to make distribution to depository libraries.

Mr. MANN. The department libraries are not depository libraries in that sense. There is one in each congressional district and two at large in each State.

Mr. BARNHART. Section 64, paragraph 1, provides as follows:

The libraries of each executive department in Washington, D. C., the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, each State and Territory, the District of Columbia, the Government of the Philippine Islands at Manila, the Government of Porto Rico at San Juan, the Pan American Union, each land-grant college, the office of the superintendent of documents, the Historical Library and Museum of Alaska, the American Antiquarian Society of Worcester, Mass., and in addition thereto not to exceed one library for each congressional district and Territory and two libraries at large for each State, to be designated by the superintendent of documents under such rules and regulations as are approved by the Joint Committee on Printing, are hereby constituted depositories of Government publications, and all designations now existing shall be permanent, except as otherwise provided in this section.

Mr. MANN. I take it all back. It is under that provision that they get the daily RECORD?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend page 92, line 21, by striking out the word "sixty" and inserting the word "eighty."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 92, line 21, strike out the word "sixty" and insert the word "eighty."

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from Indiana know how much that would cost? I think the demand for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is so great that we ought to increase the number allotted to each Member.

Mr. BARNHART. It would add one-third to the present cost of the Record.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; it would not add one-third to the present cost, but it would increase by one-third the number allotted to each Member.

Mr. BARNHART. The cost of the Record is something like \$1,000,000 per Congress. Of course, that includes the Senate.

Mr. MANN. About the only increased cost for this, of course, would be for paper, ink, and printing. It would not increase the cost of composition. Now, we are going to reduce the size of the Record, and make it more readable, under this provision. Since I have been here I think we have doubled the allotment of Records to Members. I think we used to get 29 copies apiece. Perhaps I am mistaken about that. I think there is a much greater demand for the Record than there used to be. The population of the Members' districts is considerably increased. I am not inclined to be extravagant, but I believe it would be a proper thing to increase the number of Records allotted to us.

Mr. BARNHART. The committee went over that phase of the matter and made some inquiry among Members. As far as the chairman of the committee is concerned, he does not have demands for all his Records, except where the list of names to whom Records are sent is continued from term to term. Some years ago I found myself without Records enough to supply the demand that kept coming in, and I adopted this method: At the opening of a session of Congress I sent a letter to each one to whom the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD had been sent by me in the previous Congress, and said that if he wanted the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD continued please to notify me at once, and if not I would consider that he did not want it continued, and I would send the copy going to him to some one else who was asking for it.

The result is that since then I find I very rarely have requests for all my CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS. I think the draft on me for this very important session of Congress is probably 51 Records. It was so a few days ago. I do not recall that there have been any additional requests since. I can see how, if Members permit their old lists to stand and make no effort to ascertain whether or not the Record is really acceptable, they will have an increasing list. I have constituents in my district to whom I am sending the Record who might consider it an offense if they wrote to me and told me they wanted it stopped, that they did not care to read it, and that I might send it to some one else. But I believe that if the method I have adopted were adopted by the membership generally we would find we had an ample supply of CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS.

Mr. MANN. Ah, of course the gentleman states his own case. Each one is apt to look at it from his own viewpoint. This is my practice: I want about 8 or 10 copies of the daily Record delivered at my office every day for use. I do not want them promised out in advance, and they are not sent out. I make use of them regularly. At the beginning of every session—

Mr. BARNHART. Probably there is not another Member of Congress who makes use of 10 daily Records in that way.

Mr. MANN. I have talked with a good many Members of Congress who do the same thing. Every few days something happens in the House and somebody wants to know about that particular thing, and you can send the Record and let them know about it. I am much more particular even than the gentleman from Indiana, and I have no doubt he is more particular than many. The gentleman writes and asks them if they want the Record. At the beginning of each session of Congress I strike most of them off the list, and if they do not write and kick they do not get it; but many of them do, and I never have been able to supply the demand for the Record. I do not think I have an unusual demand.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. BARNHART. Does the gentleman take into consideration the fact that he is one of the most conspicuous Members in the activities of Congress?

Mr. MANN. I do not think so.

Mr. BARNHART. That his name is in the newspapers every day as having led or opposed this and that legislation; that he is the leader of his party; and that what applies to him in the matter of requests for CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS by people interested in him would not apply to another man in the Congress of the United States?

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman is mistaken. I do not think the personal equation enters into it at all.

Mr. BARNHART. I think it does.

Mr. MANN. I do not think so.

Mr. BARNHART. I will say to the gentleman that when I retire from Congress—and that is liable to happen—and if I ever ask some one for a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it will be, in a

measure, to see what the gentleman from Illinois is starting on the floor of the House.

Mr. MANN. I will say this, that if the gentleman ever gets turned out of Congress and puts in his time reviewing what I have done in the House as it goes along, it will be of vastly great benefit to him. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARNHART. I have no doubt about that.

Mr. MANN. I am afraid he does not do it now.

Mr. BARNHART. Well, I will say, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MANN. But seriously, now, I do not often send the Record to people outside of my district. I have two or three times sent a Record to some defeated Member of Congress, but the demand for Records is by people who want to use them. It is not merely for idle reading. They follow the Record. I find when I go home—and I read the Record here every day—that I not infrequently run across somebody who seems to know more about the Record than I do, who religiously reads it; and I think it is a good thing.

Mr. SLAYDEN. They can not do anything else then.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman asked what would be the increased cost to supply 20 additional copies of the daily Record to each Member. It would cost \$72,500, on the basis of the present cost of the Record.

Mr. MANN. Of course that will only be if the Records are sent out.

Mr. BARNHART. If the allotment is printed, I take it there will be a good many corded up and never sent out, as now.

Mr. MANN. I think you correct that, do you not? You change that?

Mr. BARNHART. We limit it to five copies of the bound Record, under the present arrangement, but further than that I do not know of any change. If I have 60 copies coming to me, and some one asks me for a Record and I give an order for it, they will send the back numbers, and if they do not they go to the junk heap.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman had better correct that. I only have them send the Record from the date that the order comes in.

Mr. BARNHART. What is the gentleman going to do with the balance of the 60 Records to his credit?

Mr. MANN. Those that they do not keep to be bound I have sent to my office, and I send them out as called for. That is a good practice, and I advise the gentleman to follow it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. I was interested in the discussion between the two gentlemen as to the circulation of this great daily among the people of their respective districts. I would like to know how many people subscribe and pay for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD according to the rates printed in it.

Mr. BARNHART. In the United States?

Mr. SLAYDEN. In the United States and the Philippines.

Mr. BARNHART. In the Sixtieth Congress, first session, there were 110 subscribers; in the second session of the Sixtieth Congress, 145; in the Sixty-first Congress, first session, 110. There were 95 monthly subscribers in the first session Sixty-first Congress, in addition to the 110 session subscribers. In the second session of the Sixty-first Congress there were 160 subscribers. In the six years of the Sixtieth Congress, Sixty-first Congress, and Sixty-second Congress there was a total of 638 subscribers.

Mr. SLAYDEN. That does not indicate any great demand among the people for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It does seem to me that the distribution of 60 copies by each Member ought to supply all the literature of that sort that is needed.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, probably my calls for the Record would not be a very good index to go by, but I have not been able to supply all of the calls that have come to me. I have 56 newspapers in my district, and I can not supply all of them.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The gentleman sends the Record voluntarily to them, does he not?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. When I first came to Congress I discovered, and I presume it is the experience of others, as the man whom I succeeded was of the opposite political faith, and there never had been one of my political faith representing that district, the people were anxious to see what their Representative was going to do, and I had demands for more Records than I had copies to supply. But this demand has been growing less ever since, and it may be on account of their disappointment in their Member of Congress, on account of his lack of activity. But from time to time, and I take it it is the experience of a good many Members that their constituents become satisfied with their floor work and do not care to read about it any more.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio if he had the same experience in sending copies to newspapers that a gentleman from another State had, whose name I shall not mention. He had a great many weekly papers to whom he sent the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD until he found that they were wrapping the mail in them.

Mr. FESS. I have not had that experience, but I am frank to say I do not know whether this distribution I have made to the newspapers is a valuable one or not. I supposed that it was. On the other hand, I am also sending one copy to each college, and I have eight colleges in my district. Then I try to send one to each separate high-school library. I do not have enough to go around. Probably if I took the time to analyze the list I might reduce them; but I frankly state to you that the allotment as now allowed does not permit me to give to all these general institutions, and therefore I have not been able to respond to individuals at all.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I want to suggest to the gentleman from Ohio my own experience in the matter of the distribution of the RECORD. When I came here I did precisely what he says he has done. I did not send the RECORD to all newspapers in my district because there were not enough RECORDS to go around. In the next campaign I went into the offices of the newspapers, and they were frank to tell me that they did not read the news as old as that brought by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but they used them as wrappers for their own papers. I dropped those particular journals the next session and took up a new list, and found the same experience there. Then I adopted the plan of sending it to people who asked for it, and I have found that the only part of my constituency which takes a persistent interest in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are the farmers living without quick access to the newspapers, and not the people in the towns and at colleges. They are the men who live in the remote rural country. I fancy they are the only people who are interested. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I have used all of the gentleman's time, I ask that it be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has one minute more.

Mr. FESS. I want to confess that I have not been able to furnish any RECORDS to the farmers. Probably I have made a wrong distribution; I do not know. I would hesitate to vote for the increase in the expense, as the gentleman has stated, but at the same time I would like to have a larger allotment if it is not too much of a strain.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, at the end of line 15, page 93, by striking out the word "thirty" and inserting the word "fifty."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 93, line 15, strike out the word "thirty" and insert the word "fifty."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I understand the present allotment of copies for daily use for the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives is 50. Am I correctly informed?

Mr. BARNHART. No such information has come to the committee.

Mr. MOORE. I find that 50 copies are daily assigned to the Doorkeeper, and if we were to fix 30, as proposed here, there would be a reduction of 20 copies.

Mr. BARNHART. The present law is 30, and if any official of the House is receiving 50, and the law authorizes him only to have 30, the committee knows nothing about that method of procedure. There has been no request to the committee for any increase. The bill has been submitted to all of the officers of the House. I do not know that they have read it, but there has been no request of that sort to the committee.

Mr. MOORE. I wish to say to the gentleman and to the committee that frequent requests are made for copies of the RECORD by Members of the House. It may be true that the gentleman's constituents are not always interested in the RECORD, and it may be true that the constituents of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] are not always interested in the RECORD, but there are other Members—

Mr. BARNHART. I am not clear on the gentleman's position. These 50 are issued to the Doorkeeper of the House. What use has he for them?

Mr. MOORE. I am informed that 50 copies are left here each morning for the use of the Members of the House on the floor.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. And I am quite sure of my own knowledge that there are times when the supply of daily RECORDS for the

use of the Members is very quickly exhausted. We may want to read one of our own speeches, unlike the constituents of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], who spoke a moment ago. If nobody else is interested in our speeches, it is true that sometimes we are ourselves and like to look them up.

Mr. BARNHART. One is supplied for each Member of the House every morning.

Mr. MOORE. That is true, but frequently demands are made here by Members during the day in excess of the 50. This question arose, because 15 minutes ago I had occasion to ask for a copy of the RECORD which contained a speech made during the war-tax discussion, and I was informed that the supply was exhausted. I believe the date was September 25. The Clerk said to me he hoped that I was not going to ask for the RECORD of September 25 because there had been a heavy demand for that and all recent requests had been turned down. They had no more of them. I got another copy of another date, which served as well, and that is what brings this matter to my attention now.

Mr. BARNHART. That is one particular instance, but does the gentleman from Pennsylvania believe that these allotments ought to be increased generally to cover such instances?

Mr. MOORE. I am just informed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] that he was unable to get a copy of the RECORD here which contained the war-tax speech of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. Naturally there is pressure and demand for these speeches at times. I have frequently had occasion to ask for copies here and have found the daily supply exhausted.

Mr. BARNHART. That is true in many other instances in Congress, but the committee tried to reach a happy medium in which all wants would be taken care of, and if we were to increase all along the line, to meet possible emergencies, the extra amount of printing that we would do would get us into the same rut that we are trying to get out of, and that is a great superfluity of documents that can not be used.

Mr. MOORE. I have in my hand now a cover of one of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS showing that 50 copies are delivered here to the Clerk of the House each day.

Mr. BARNHART. But the gentleman has been talking about the Doorkeeper and not the Clerk of the House.

Mr. MOORE. It is addressed to the Clerk of the House, care of Frank W. Collier, and it is a part of the assignment to the Doorkeeper as per this bill:

And to the Doorkeeper of the House, 10 copies in daily or bound form; and not to exceed 30 daily copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

That is a reduction of 20 copies per day.

Mr. BARNHART. If the gentleman will look at page 93, line 7, he will find this language, providing for a new division:

To the Secretary and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and to the Clerk and the Doorkeeper of the House, 10 copies each, in daily or bound form, and not to exceed 20 daily copies each for office use.

Mr. MOORE. Does not that lead to confusion?

Mr. BARNHART. And further along the language to which he has just referred is clear. There is an abundance, it would seem to me. That makes 50 copies that now come here, according to the memorandum the gentleman has.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAXN) there were—ayes 7, noes 20.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. Have we any relationship with the Parliament of England by which we get the reports of the proceedings in Parliament in exchange for our proceedings? Do we get the reports from England?

Mr. BARNHART. The Library of Congress gets the International Exchange.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 70. PAR. 1. The Public Printer shall, upon requisition of the superintendent of documents, who is hereby charged with the distribution of the Revised Statutes and Supplements thereto, print, bind, and deliver to the latter as many volumes of the Revised Statutes of the United States and the Supplements thereto as may be needed for distribution to State supreme court libraries, to United States courts not already supplied, to supply deficiencies and offices newly created, and to be sold by him under the provisions of section 58 of this act: *Provided*, That the superintendent of documents shall, at the beginning of the first session of each Congress, distribute to each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in such Congress not previously supplied one copy of the Revised Statutes of the United States and the Supplements thereto: *Provided further*, That no Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner during his term or terms of service shall receive more than one copy of such Revised Statutes and Supplements thereto.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 96, line 5, after the first word "to," strike out "State supreme court libraries" and insert "the library of the court of last resort of each State."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 70. *AR. 2.* After the close of each Congress the Secretary of State shall have edited and printed the Statutes at Large enacted by that Congress, and the Public Printer shall deliver to the superintendent of documents as many bound copies as may be needed to meet the following distribution: To the President of the United States, 4 copies, one of which shall be for the library of the Executive Office; to the Vice President, each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner, 1 copy; to the librarian of the Senate, for the use of Senators, not to exceed 120 copies; to the librarian of the House, for the use of Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners, not to exceed 200 copies; to the Department of State, including those for the use of legations and consulates, not to exceed 380 copies; to the Treasury Department, including those for the use of officers of customs, not to exceed 300 copies; to the War Department, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Navy Department, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Department of the Interior, including those for the use of surveyors general and registers and receivers of public-land offices, not to exceed 250 copies; to the Post Office Department, not to exceed 50 copies; to the Interstate Commerce Commission, not to exceed 10 copies; to the Civil Service Commission, 4 copies; to the Department of Justice, including those for the use of the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States and the judges and the officers of the United States and Territorial courts, not to exceed 800 copies; to the Department of Agriculture, not to exceed 50 copies; to the Department of Commerce, not to exceed 300 copies; to the Department of Labor, not to exceed 50 copies; to the Smithsonian Institution, 2 copies; to the Pan American Union, 2 copies; to the Governor General of the Philippine Islands, at Manila, 2 copies; to the Governor of Porto Rico, at San Juan, 2 copies; to the Government Printing Office, 2 copies; and a sufficient number of copies for distribution to the library of the court of last resort of each State.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice that the Statutes at Large are to be distributed, one to each Senator, Representative, and so forth. Then, having given each Senator one, the gentleman proposes to give to the Librarian of the Senate 120 copies for the use of the Senators. I expect that is the existing law, but what is the object, if the gentleman happens to know, of this extravagant distribution of these pamphlets to the Senators? They can not have any use for them. I think the gentleman is satisfied with giving to the librarian of the House 200 copies. Of course that does not go all the way around. I do not know what the Senators will do with the extra copies of the Statutes at Large.

Mr. BARNHART. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the committee's only means of information was by calling on these different officials and inquiring if the present enactment was sufficient and if they were really needed; and in many instances numbers were changed by the officials both of the House and Senate. Sometimes they increased, sometimes decreased, and we took the report of these officials that the librarians need that amount; at least they did not report to the contrary, and that is the basis of procedure on the part of the committee in fixing the amount, leaving it as I think like the present law. No, the Senate has an increase of 20 and that was on the demand of the librarian.

Mr. MANN. What do they do with them?

Mr. BARNHART. Well, I do not know, but the committee could not inquire of every official appearing before it what is done with the documents allotted to him.

Mr. MANN. Of course I know the Senate Committee on Printing always gets the chairmanship of the Joint Committee on Printing and appoints the clerk to the Committee on Printing and probably has a little more influence than the House side has. The result is that Senators get more than two copies of the Statutes at Large and Members of the House get less than two, having no more use for them than we have. My observation is that they do not examine them any more carefully than we do. But that is neither here nor there. I want to make a suggestion to the gentleman—

Mr. BARNHART. I will explain that briefly, as I want to keep the Committee on Printing clear in the estimation of the Committee of the Whole House—

Mr. MANN. I am not complaining of the committee in reference to that.

Mr. BARNHART (continuing). It is this: The librarian of the Senate said there is a constant and general demand that they might have a copy at the home office and one in Washington. Our librarian here made no such request, and when such a request is made of our committee and they say that there is a demand for it, that they want it, if we did not put it in the bill it would probably go on in the Senate anyhow, and the short cut was to put it in here.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows they do not make any more use of the Statutes at Large in their home offices, which they do not have as a rule, than Members of the House do; that not as many Senators have a home office as Members of the House. That is neither here nor there, but I want to make a suggestion—

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman understands that while he is not permitted to offer any reflection on any Member here, he can appreciate what the gentleman from Illinois has said that they probably have no more use for them, but certain Members of the Senate think they have more use for documents, and so forth, than Members of the House. Of that I am fully convinced.

Mr. MANN. I am quite willing to give copies of the statutes to people who make use of them, but I would like to make this suggestion for future effect: We print the public laws and private laws now in separate volumes, and it is an expensive publication, as the gentleman knows. The private laws, in the main, consist of omnibus pension bills. I do not believe there is any necessity of distributing private laws with the same degree of liberality that there is of public laws to every department and branch of the Government where we send the public laws.

I do not know whether you could effect economy in that way or not, but I would request the prayerful consideration of the gentleman from Indiana to the idea of dispensing with the filling up of so many libraries with volumes of private laws which no one ever looks at. They may look at the proclamations sometimes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 71. The pamphlet laws of each session of Congress and the bound copies of the Statutes at Large of each Congress shall be legal evidence of the laws and treaties therein contained in all the courts of the United States and of the several States therein. The pamphlet laws of each session of Congress and the Statutes at Large of each Congress shall contain all laws and concurrent and joint resolutions passed by Congress, and also all conventions, treaties, proclamations, and agreements: *Provided*, That neither the Revised Statutes of the United States, nor the Statutes at Large, nor the session laws shall be published in any newspaper at the expense of the United States.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, on page 100, after the figures "71," in line 4, down to and including the word "therein," in line 8.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 100, lines 4 and 8, strike out the following language:

"The pamphlet laws of each session of Congress and the bound copies of the Statutes at Large of each Congress shall be legal evidence of the laws and treaties therein contained in all the courts of the United States and of the several States therein."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that it is important whether it goes out or stays in, but this is not where it belongs. It is not in this law that we ought to fix what is evidence in the courts. That is carried by the law relating to the courts. It was up recently in the codification bill which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WATKINS] had charge of, and I believe it is a provision in the law now, and it is also carried in the other law. Is this in the identical language of the printing law now?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I believe that the slip laws are evidence in court. My recollection is that they are. We print a slip law and a pamphlet law in bound volume of the Statutes at Large. The printing act makes the bound copies of the pamphlet laws evidence. I think the statute that governs on the subject—although I may be mistaken—makes the slip law evidence, and when we print one of these copies here by authority of Congress it does not have to be a certified copy nor do we have to wait until it is printed in pamphlet form before it can be introduced in evidence.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, does it say it shall be evidence in the courts of the States?

Mr. BARNHART. In the courts of the United States and the several States therein.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, it is the present law, I suppose, and no objection to it on that score, but I do not see exactly how Congress can pass an act declaring what shall be evidence in the courts of a State. The Constitution of the United States provides that the Constitution and all laws made in pursuance thereof shall be the supreme law of the land and be binding. Of course, it is the law in the State, but how the Congress of the United States can declare what shall be evidence in the courts of a State passes my comprehension.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield? Most States have a section in their code saying that public laws and acts of

another State shall be evidence when printed under the public authority of that State, of the laws of that State.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Certainly. The States can do it, but how can Congress say what shall be evidence in the State of Missouri?

Mr. BORLAND. Printed under the authority of Congress. I think that is true in most State courts.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is your State law?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Well, here is an attempt to say by Congress what shall be evidence in a State court.

Mr. MANN. Suppose a State did not permit any method of approving the law, they could not nullify an act of Congress in that way?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Not at all. If the gentleman will pardon me, as I caught the reading of it—I do not have it before me—it is not a declaration that it shall be the law in the State courts.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; it is evidence. But if you leave it to the State how the law should be approved, and the State did not permit any method of approving the law, that would be to set aside the law in the State courts.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That would be a question for the court itself to pass upon in the absence of a legislative act.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. In the absence of a legislative act the courts themselves could determine what was evidence. It is possibly an academic discussion. I do not want to take up any time with it, but I wanted to call attention, Mr. Chairman, to what seems to me to be a very peculiar thing to do, in that the Congress of the United States should declare by legislation what should be evidence in the State courts.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 72. The following shall be printed and distributed as provided in this act:

(1) Annual reports of the officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That the annual reports required by law to be submitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, by the officers thereof shall be printed as congressional documents of the session to which they are to be submitted.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Section 72 says:

The following shall be printed and distributed as provided in this act.

How is that, now? Is it the valuation distribution which is referred to there?

Mr. BARNHART. No. I will say this does not refer to valuation. This does not come to us through the folding room.

Mr. MANN. It says "printed and distributed as provided in this act."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The valuation only applies to the folding room.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no. The gentleman is mistaken about that. It applies to certain documents. Where is it provided in this act that these shall be distributed?

Mr. BARNHART. In section 44. It is a standing provision. It is the usual number.

Mr. MANN. That is what is intended by it?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And it does not come under the valuation?

Mr. BARNHART. Not under the valuation.

Mr. MANN. It is difficult to tell from the reading. Section 44 provides for printing of documents by order of the House or the Senate.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Paragraph 3, section 44, if the gentleman will look, will possibly cover it. It is on page 40.

Mr. MANN. That is to define what a Government publication is. I will not say there is not any provision in the bill covering it. The bill is a good one.

Mr. BARNHART. On page 42, section 46, line 20, it says:

Of the House numbered documents and reports, excepting reports on private bills and simple and concurrent resolutions, there shall be distributed—

And so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(2) Book of Estimates: *Provided*, That the annual estimates of appropriations transmitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury as provided by law shall be printed as a congressional document of the session to which they are submitted and be ready for delivery on the first day of each regular session of Congress: *Provided further*, That the Committee on Appropriations of each House is authorized to have printed and bound in half morocco not to exceed 100 copies thereof for its own use.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, to strike out the words "one hundred," on page 101, lines 6 and 7, and insert "ten."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 101, lines 6 and 7, strike out the words "one hundred" and insert in lieu thereof the word "ten."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the clerk of the House Committee on Appropriations tells me it is not necessary to have more than 10 copies of the Book of Estimates bound, as provided in this particular paragraph. He states he has never had more than that number bound in any one year, and it is at his suggestion that I have offered this amendment. It is simply in the interest of economy, because the additional number is not necessary.

Mr. BARNHART. We will accept the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee how many copies of the Book of Estimates this provides for printing?

The CHAIRMAN. That covers the usual number.

Mr. MANN. Five hundred for the House.

Mr. BARNHART. Thirteen hundred and forty-five.

Mr. BORLAND. What becomes of those?

Mr. BARNHART. They go to the document room.

Mr. BORLAND. Are they sent to the document room or the folding room?

Mr. BARNHART. To the document room.

Mr. BORLAND. Is there demand for that number of copies of the Book of Estimates?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. Of course, 500 go to libraries.

Mr. BORLAND. To what libraries?

Mr. BARNHART. To the depository libraries—to the departments and the other depository libraries.

Mr. BORLAND. That is, out of the 1,345?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. What has been the consumption of the remaining 800? Are they all gone?

Mr. BARNHART. The committee is not prepared to advise the gentleman from Missouri as to that.

Mr. BORLAND. It seems to me that that is a large number of copies of the Book of Estimates, which is a large book, and it must be expensive to print.

Mr. BARNHART. We had the superintendent of documents before us, and he went over all these matters very carefully, and he gave us a number of very liberal reductions. After taking 500 from the 1,345 it leaves barely more than one for each Member and Senator.

Mr. BORLAND. My experience is that each Member does not use one copy.

Mr. BARNHART. Even then it is necessary, and the provision is that there shall be that many.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Missouri will yield, the gentleman from Indiana awhile ago referred me to paragraph 3 in section 46 for the authority fixing the distribution of these documents, and under that 500 go to the House folding room.

Mr. BARNHART. To the House folding room?

Mr. MANN. To the House document room; not to, exceed 500.

Mr. BORLAND. Does any portion of them go to the folding room?

Mr. MANN. No.

Mr. BORLAND. Where is the provision under which that number is fixed? I do not think I know where it is in the bill. The gentleman referred to "the usual number."

Mr. MANN. "The usual number" comes from the number which are distributed to the House and the Senate and to public depositories, or in some cases to the President and the executive departments. Certain documents by direction go in certain numbers. That is "the usual number" as to any document. It varies slightly.

Mr. BORLAND. I notice in section 70, paragraph 3, that there is an express enumeration of the number of copies of the pamphlet laws to be furnished to each one of these departments. Now, is there an enumeration somewhere of "the usual number," as it is called, of these other documents?

Mr. MANN. I do not think there is an enumeration at any place. That is the specific number provided for. Take this section 46, paragraph 3, that was referred to a little while ago:

Of the House numbered documents and reports, excepting reports on private bills and simple and concurrent resolutions, there shall be dis-

tributed, unbound, to the Senate document room, not to exceed 150 copies; to the office of the Secretary of the Senate, not to exceed 10 copies; to the House document room, not to exceed 500 copies; and to the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 20 copies—

And so forth.

Now, there are other provisions in the bill which require these same documents to go to certain other officials, and also to certain public depositories; and the total required for distribution makes it what they call "the usual number."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri withdraws the pro forma amendment. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(3) Statement of appropriations: *Provided*, That the statement of all appropriations made during each session of Congress, including new offices created and the salaries of each, and salaries of the offices which are increased and the amounts of such increase authorized by the act of July 4, 1836, shall be prepared under the direction of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives, and said statement shall show also the offices the salaries of which are reduced or omitted, and the amount of such reduction, and shall also contain a chronological history of the regular appropriation bills passed during the session for which it is prepared. The foregoing statement of appropriations shall be printed at the close of each regular session of Congress as a document thereof, and the Committee on Appropriations of each House is authorized to have printed and bound in half morocco not to exceed 100 copies thereof for its own use.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 101, in line 13, after the word "thirty-six," insert the words "and amendments thereof."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that since the act of July 4, 1836, was passed, there have been two amendments, one adopted in 1888 and the other in 1897, relating to statements of appropriations. My attention was called to the fact, and it was suggested that this amendment ought to be adopted in order to preserve the requirements of the present law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 19, on page 101, after the word "prepared," insert the following: "and exhibit of amounts of contracts authorized by appropriation acts in addition to the appropriations made therein, and specific reference to all indefinite appropriations made at each session."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this is exactly in accord with the mandatory act of July 19, 1897.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I ask to strike out the word "one," line 24, page 101, and insert the word "two," so as to make it read, "200 copies."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 24, page 101, strike out the word "one," at the beginning of the line, and insert the word "two."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Tennessee what the purpose of the extra number is?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations states that 100 copies are not sufficient.

This past year he had either 120 or 125 bound, and they were necessary in order to make the proper distribution. This bill does not provide that any particular number of copies shall be bound, but says not exceeding a certain number shall be bound, and inasmuch as 100 are not sufficient, and only a sufficient number will be bound to supply the necessary number for

distribution, it is thought that the limit should be made 200 rather than 100.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to make an inquiry. Are these the only copies of this document that are printed?

Mr. BARNHART. The usual number in addition.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am informed by the chairman of the committee that the usual number are printed, in addition to those here mentioned.

Mr. MANN. I venture to say you can send out to the document room now and find 300 copies that are unused.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman will understand that these copies are distributed to the chairmen of the various committees, certainly the various appropriating committees, the heads of the departments, and the heads of important bureaus in the various departments.

Mr. MANN. I understand they get them anyhow. Of course, if they get them bound they are in a little better shape than if they get them here unbound.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They are bound for permanent use and permanent filing.

Mr. MANN. They are of no special value after the year has gone by. They are for current use, mainly for current legislative use. I have no doubt that the clerk of the committee makes good use of them. I am frank to say that I think usually I get one of them, and it is very convenient. Yet I could have one bound myself. We have a large number going to waste undoubtedly now, however.

Mr. BARNHART. If the gentleman will yield, the committee could see no danger of any serious extravagance in this, because it is up to the Committee on Appropriations not to have more than it actually needs, and as it used more than 100 last year I think it is fair to assume that there will be no waste, and the committee will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

(12) Daily Consular and Trade Reports, Department of Commerce: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to have printed, for distribution by the Department of Commerce, not to exceed 5,000 copies of any one issue of the Consular and Trade Reports, the distribution of which shall be confined to copies sent to consular officers and other Government officers for official use, to chambers of commerce and similar commercial organizations, to schools and colleges, to public libraries, to the press, and for the use of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in exchanges and replying to inquiries relative to foreign trade. Other copies shall be sold by the superintendent of documents at the rate of \$2.50 per annum: *Provided*, That that part of section 208 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by an act to establish the Department of Commerce and Labor, approved February 14, 1903, authorizing the submission to Congress of the annual report known as the "Commercial Relations of the United States," is hereby repealed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, page 108, line 2, by striking out the word "five" and inserting the word "twenty."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 108, line 2, strike out the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty."

Mr. BARNHART. I will ask the gentleman from Illinois if he will consent to the reading of the balance of the section up to paragraph 73? That is as far as the committee intend to go this evening. It is just the next page, and then we might go back if we have any time.

Mr. MANN. I do not want to take it up to-night, and I am willing to have the section read, with the understanding that we may return to this paragraph for amendment.

Mr. BARNHART. The amendment will be considered as pending.

Mr. MANN. I have another amendment.

Mr. BARNHART. Very well. With that understanding I will ask the Clerk to read up to 73, and then I will move that the committee rise.

Mr. MANN. You might ask unanimous consent to pass over this paragraph, with leave to return for amendment.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; that is understood.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to pass over the paragraph just read, with the privilege of returning to it. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

(16) Annals of the Astrophysical Observatory of the Smithsonian Institution: *Provided*, That not to exceed 1,500 copies are authorized to be printed for distribution by the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Illinois if he wishes to discuss his amendment now?

Mr. MANN. No; I think not to-night.

Mr. BARNHART. Very well. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAGE of North Carolina, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15902) to amend, revise, and codify the laws relating to the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 12665. An act to increase the limit of cost of public building at La Junta, Colo.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE PRESENT CONGRESS.

Mr. REILLY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD some remarks on the general political subject of the accomplishments of this Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on accomplishments of the present Congress. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, which I shall not exercise, I want to say that if this bill which we are now considering, and which I suppose the gentleman from Wisconsin is favorable to, were a law, granting consent would do him no good.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Treasury Department.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Treasury Department. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, October 16, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Lake River, including Bachelors Slough, Wash. (H. Doc. No. 1176), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 19299) for the temporary relief of cotton growers of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KAHN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 371) authorizing the President to extend invitations to other nations to appoint delegates or representatives to the Panama-Pacific Dental Congress, to be held at San Francisco, Cal., August 30 to September 9, inclusive, 1915; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 372) providing for a national security commission; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GLASS: A bill (H. R. 19300) for the relief of the heirs of Edward A. Scott; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HARRISON (by request): A bill (H. R. 19301) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Jane Clarke; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 19302) granting a pension to David E. Stanwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOBSON: A bill (H. R. 19303) for the relief of Emma Louise Du Bois, heir of Amos Towle; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 19304) for the relief of Augusta Reiter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAHAN: A bill (H. R. 19305) granting an increase of pension to Robert V. Horton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 19306) for the relief of Halvor Nilsen; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 19307) to correct the military record of James P. Collins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. AINEY: Protest of W. H. Millard, of Lawton, Pa., against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of H. J. Fritz, of Hastings, Pa.; the Salberg Hotel, of Ridgway, Pa.; and B. E. Moon, of Johnstown, Pa., protesting against tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Pennsylvania Pharmaceutical Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against tax on patent medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARR: Petition of F. L. Hall, manager of Dixie Theater, Uniontown, Pa., protesting against tax on theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. Beachly, of Garrett; Henry Frazier, of Somerset; Dr. H. H. Miller, of Davidsville; Rev. W. Finke, of Boswell; and Robert Fogle, of Garrett, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against tax per horsepower on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of David J. Reese, secretary of the Pennsylvania Pharmaceutical Association, Philadelphia, Pa.; telegrams of the Hostetter Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.; and J. D. Armstrong Drug Co., Brownsville, Pa., protesting against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, New York City, protesting against tax on motion-picture theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DECKER: Petition of John W. Leake and other citizens of Missouri, relative to recognition for Dr. Frederick A. Cook; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DEITRICK: Petition of the Epworth League of Melrose, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GRAY: Petition of W. F. Werner and sundry citizens of the United States, protesting against tax on drugs and medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of L. A. Mills, Ed. E. Jenkins, J. L. Ashworth, L. E. Green, W. H. Johnson, and J. H. McCarty & Sons, of the sixth congressional district of Indiana, protesting against special revenue tax on drugs and medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of P. J. O'Meara, L. C. Henry, Frank Hayward, and Frank A. Watt, protesting against various items of pending emergency revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINDS: Petition of citizens of Gorham, Me., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KAHN: Petitions of the Twenty-first Avenue Baptist Sunday School and Baptist Sunday School of San Francisco, Cal., for Federal censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of the Owl Drug Co., of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: Petition of Edward Brown and 59 others, all residents of Thomaston, Me., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MURRAY: Petition of Baptist Young People's Union of Guthrie, Okla., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Petitions of Congregational Church of Conroy and Union of the Methodist, Congregational, and Christian Churches of Sheffield, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of pharmacists of Greenfield, Mass., protesting against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.